



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(GUILDFORD)**

**REVIEW OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN AREAS OUTSIDE THE  
GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE  
AND AD-HOC CHANGES THROUGHOUT THE BOROUGH**

**21 MARCH 2012**

**KEY ISSUE**

This report presents representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals aimed at improving the regulation of parking in various locations throughout the borough, where issues have previously been raised, and asks the Committee to consider these. It also makes recommendations to make the order to introduce new parking controls.

**SUMMARY**

As the concluding part of the review of parking outside the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone, this report presents representations received as a result of the formal advertisement of ad-hoc measures. These proposals attempt to resolve various issues raised across the borough. It recommends that a traffic regulation order is made to implement the proposals developed for the 18 highest scoring locations previously identified. It recommends that these are introduced broadly as advertised, with a few relatively minor amendments which generally lessen the nature and / or extents of those proposals in various locations. It also makes recommendations to make a traffic regulation order to introduce new Disabled Persons Parking Spaces, and to formalise some existing advisory ones, with a few minor amendments to account for changes in circumstances. Furthermore, the report also recommends that a traffic regulation order is made to amend the existing controls to accommodate recently created vehicle crossovers and building developments, again with a few minor

amendments to account for changes in circumstances. It also makes recommendations to make a traffic regulation order to introduce amendments to the existing controls in Southway and Egerton Road, stemming from the geographic element of the review and the re-engineering of the access to the Royal Surrey County Hospital. Finally, it makes recommendations to make a small number of technical changes to the order so that it matches the restrictions in-situ.

## OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

**The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree that:**

- (i) a traffic regulation order is made to broadly implement the proposals developed for the 18 highest scoring locations identified in **ANNEXE 3**, as proposed, with a few relatively minor amendments which lessen the nature and / or extents of those proposals in various locations, and as detailed in **ANNEXE 7**,
- (ii) a traffic regulation order is made to broadly implement the proposals developed to introduce formalised disabled parking bays identified in **ANNEXE 4** as proposed, with a few minor amendments to account for changes in circumstances, and as detailed in **ANNEXE 7**,
- (iii) a traffic regulation order is made to broadly implement the proposals developed to accommodate newly created vehicle crossovers and new developments identified in **ANNEXE 5** as proposed, with a few minor amendments to account for changes in circumstances, and as detailed in **ANNEXE 7**,
- (iv) a traffic regulation order is made to implement the proposals developed to introduce amendments to the existing controls in Southway and Egerton Road, and as detailed in **ANNEXE 7**,
- (v) a traffic regulation order is made to make a small number of technical changes to the order so that it matches the restrictions in-situ, and as identified in **ANNEXE 7**,
- (vi) following the making of the above traffic regulation orders that the orders in the Town and Parished Areas be consolidated.
- (vii) the effectiveness of the new restrictions is reviewed during the next review of the area.

## 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In December 2004 the Committee agreed a cycle of reviews alternating between the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ) and the areas outside the CPZ. It was envisaged that each cycle would take 18 months with implementation of the changes from one review being implemented during the last six months and coinciding as the design phase for the next review (see **ANNEXE 1**).
- 1.2 The last review concerning issues outside the CPZ reviewed the situation in Ash, Ash Vale and Ripley, which was completed in 2008. The last review dealing with issues within the CPZ was completed in 2010.
- 1.3 Prior to, and since the Borough Council's Parking Services took over responsibility for formalised parking controls throughout the borough, numerous requests for parking controls have been received.
- 1.4 Although, in many cases, these have subsequently formed the basis of the geographic-based parking reviews, such as those previously undertaken in Ash, Ash Vale and Ripley, and those that formed the geographic element of this review, in the Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Slyfield, Stoughton and Westborough, there are many others issues in various other locations which need to be considered.
- 1.5 At its meeting in September 2009, the Committee agreed an assessment methodology by which the various requests for other controls would be assessed (see **ANNEXE 2**).
- 1.6 In total, there have been requests for controls in 117 specific locations. At its meeting in September 2010, the Committee agreed that, following an initial desktop study, 30 of these locations should be assessed fully.
- 1.7 Subsequently, accident data came to light in Chester Road, Ash, a location that initially did not qualify for a full assessment, which meant that this location scored over 15, and therefore merited full assessment. As a result, in total, 31 locations were assessed fully (see **ANNEXE 3**).
- 1.8 Of the 31 locations assessed fully, 18 of them scored 30 or more, and proposals were subsequently developed.
- 1.9 At its meeting in September 2009, the Committee also agreed that requests for disabled parking spaces and changes necessary to accommodate newly created vehicle crossovers and building developments would be included in the most convenient review, rather than waiting for a review dealing with that particular location. **ANNEXE 4 and 5** of this report identify these.
- 1.10 The geographic element of the parking review involving the Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Slyfield, Stoughton and Westborough areas of Guildford, and involving over 14.5 kilometres of new and amended controls, were introduced on 1 August 2011.

- 1.11 At its meeting in June 2011, the Committee agreed to formally advertise the proposals developed in the 18 locations and contained within **ANNEXE 6\*** of that report (Item 16). The proposals were subsequently advertised between 2-23 December 2011.
- 1.12 At its meeting in June 2011, the Committee also agreed that any unresolved objections that may arise in relation to the formal advertising of these proposals be decided, in accordance with the County Council's constitution, by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the relevant divisional member and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman.
- 1.13 Following the receipt of over 100 representations including four petitions (two of which meet the criteria for reporting to the Committee), officers met with local ward and divisional members. Following further discussions with the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman it was decided that all the representations received be reported to the Committee, hence this report.
- 1.14 This report presents the formal representations to the Committee and asks members to consider them before deciding the way forward.

## 2 ANALYSIS

- 2.1 Of the 117 locations assessed during the initial desktop study, 31 were subsequently subject to a full assessment, and of these, proposals were developed in 18 locations.
- 2.2 The full assessment considered each location of these locations in terms of the criteria identified in **ANNEXE 2** and has a maximum score of 100. A summary of the scores resulting from the full assessment of the 31 locations can be seen in **ANNEXE 3**.
- 2.3 In some cases, in order to try to resolve issues in specific locations, and mitigate against potential displacement elsewhere, more extensive controls were developed, in locations not previously highlighted as being problematic. The proposals developed in New Road, Chilworth, Ash Street and around Ash Railway Station, Ash and Kingfisher Drive, Merrow are examples of this, where a series of measures were proposed around several junctions in the area, rather than just the one or two highlighted.
- 2.4 The proposals developed, and that were agreed at the June 2011 meeting of the Committee were formally advertised between 2-23 December 2011.
- 2.5 In total 111 representations were received, including 4 petitions, regarding 15 of the proposals (see summary below).

Ash Railway Station (Ash) – 3

Ash Street (Ash) – 2  
Boxgrove Lane (Guildford) – 3  
Chantry View Road (Guildford) – 6  
East Horsley – 1  
Egerton Road (Guildford) – 1  
Kingfisher Drive (Guildford) – 10  
Lower Road (Effingham) – 5  
Manor Road (Ash) – 1  
New Road (Chilworth) - 28, including 3 petitions  
Ripley – 4  
Winchester Road (Ash) – 3  
Shere – 13  
Southway (Guildford) – 1  
Stratford Road (Ash Vale) – 30, including 1 petition

- 2.6 The proposals in 12 locations resulted in no representations received (see summary below).

Clandon Road (Send)  
Easington Place (Guildford)  
Epsom Road (West Horsley)  
Gardner Road (Guildford)  
George Road (Guildford)  
Haydon Place (Guildford)  
Kings Road / Chinthurst Lane (Shalford)  
Shawfield Road (Ash Vale)  
Stoughton Road (Guildford)  
The Street (Tongham)  
Vale Road (Ash Vale)  
Wharf Road (Ash Vale)

**Ash Railway Station (Ash)**

- 2.7 Three representations have been received from 3 addresses about the proposals in and around the railway station (see **ANNEXE 6.1\***).
- 2.8 Although one of the representations highlights concerns about the present situation in Britten Close, close to its junction with Ash Church Road, the issues raised in the other representations are, in the main, concerned about the loss of parking associated the proposed measures, and the potential displacement effect elsewhere in the vicinity.
- 2.9 The proposals around Ash railway station have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around various junctions / bends. As explained in para.2.3, however, the scope of the measures were extended to mitigate against the potential displacement parking around nearby junctions in the vicinity, such as the junction of Britten Close and Ash Church Road.

- 2.10 At present, parking in Chester Road, close to the junctions of Chester Close and Potters Crescent, and particularly that which takes place on the bend, causes forward visibility issues for those proceeding along the road, and those wishing to enter the Chester Road from these two junctions. Indeed, parking in Chester Road in the vicinity of the junction with Potters Crescent has been highlighted as a contributory factor in the personal injury accident that led to the location being reassessed for inclusion within the review. The proposed measures around the junctions will improve this. While parking by rail commuters does cause issues during the day, similar parking issues can also take place in the evenings. Furthermore, measures are proposed on the inside of the bend and opposite the Chester Close and Potters Crescent junctions to prevent parking which further impedes visibility, and would possibly exacerbate the situation, were inside of the bend left uncontrolled.
- 2.11 The current parking in Foreman Road, results in a significant length of uninterrupted parking between, and close to, its junctions with Ash Church Road and Foreman Park. The proposed measures will improve visibility for those entering the road from these two junctions and help avoid situations where motorists that commit to proceeding, are confronted by oncoming traffic previously obscured by the parked vehicles.
- 2.12 The primary focus of the ad-hoc review of parking issues is to deal with safety, access and traffic flow issues. Whilst the measures in the vicinity of Ash railway station will reduce the overall availability of parking space, as would the introduction of any formalised controls, the majority of the kerb space which is currently parked upon will continue to be available for motorists to use.
- 2.13 Concerns about traffic speeds in Ash Church Road have been raised with the appropriate department of Surrey County Council and also Surrey Police.
- 2.14 The local borough and county councillors also highlighted the sale of vehicles upon the highway in the lay-by to the west of the Ash Church Road / Foreman Road junction. Formalised parking restrictions are not generally introduced to deal with 'nuisance' parking, unless it compromises safety, access and traffic flow, and other legislation exists to deal with this. Parking within the lay-by away from the junction and the bus stop do not generally cause issues. Nevertheless these concerns have been highlighted to the appropriate department of Guildford Borough Council. Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group may also wish to consider introducing bus stop clearway designation order with the appropriate sign and road markings, as might be advisable for all stops in the vicinity of formalised parking controls. This would allow Parking Services' officers to enforce the controls whilst patrolling the nearby formalised restrictions and help deter motorists avoiding the latter from encroaching upon the bus stops.

2.15 The recommended proposals to be Made as an Order, and unchanged from those formally advertised, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**.

**Ash Street (Ash)**

2.16 Two representations have been received from 2 addresses about the proposals in and around Ash Street (see **ANNEXE 6.2\***).

2.17 The issues raised in the representations are, in the main, concerned about the loss of parking associated the proposed measures, and the increased pressure on the uncontrolled areas that will remain. The resident at No.73 raises particular concerns about the possible impact on the use of their vehicular access, whilst the other representee suggests that more extensive controls should be consider in some locations, whilst lesser or no controls should be introduced elsewhere, where proposals have been developed. The latter also makes mention of the use of the bus stop lay-by outside the One-Stop shop.

2.18 The proposals in Ash Street have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around various junctions and major points of private access onto the highway, such as the school and garage. Indeed, parking in the road has been highlighted as a contributory factor in a number of personal injury accidents. As explained in para.2.3, however, the scope of the measures were extended to mitigate against the potential displacement parking around nearby junctions in the vicinity, such as the junction of Ash Lodge Drive and various of the cul-de-sacs in the vicinity. The extents of the various proposed restrictions are appropriate with the nature of Ash Street, it being a classified road and a bus route, and the various junctions off it.

2.19 Formalised parking restrictions are not generally considered, nor indeed their extents determined, by the presence of individual private points of vehicular access onto the public highway. In such circumstances, advisory measures, such as advisory protection markings, are generally considered. Indeed, such markings are evident elsewhere within Ash Street.

2.20 In respect to the bus stop lay-by on the south side of Ash Street, outside the On Stop Shop, this stop serves the No.20 bus service which operates 7am-11pm Monday-Saturday and 9am-11pm on Sundays. For much of the weekday period, services operate every 15 minutes. Therefore, the use of no waiting at any time restrictions is warranted. Indeed, Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group may wish to consider introducing a bus stop clearway designation order with the appropriate sign and road markings. This would allow Parking Services' officers to enforce the controls whilst patrolling the nearby formalised restrictions and help deter motorists avoiding the latter from encroaching upon the bus stop.

2.21 The local borough and county councillors also highlighted the possible use of advisory measures, as used elsewhere within Ash Street to protect private points of access on, and the possible marking of the bus stop on the

north side of Ash Street, east of its junction with Star Lane. The possible introduction of such markings will be raised with the appropriate departments of Surrey County Council.

- 2.22 The recommended proposals to be Made as an Order, and unchanged from those formally advertised, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**.

**Boxgrove Lane (Merrow)**

- 2.23 Three representations have been received from 3 addresses about the proposals in and around Boxgrove Lane (see **ANNEXE 6.3\***).

- 2.24 Although the representations are generally supportive of the need for controls, concerns have been raised about their impact on parking on the north side of the road, and the need for additional / more extensive controls.

- 2.25 The proposals in Boxgrove Lane have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around various junctions and to protect the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings. As such, they are not intended to specifically deal with the school-run periods, although obviously it is hoped that they will assist in this regard. The position and extents of the proposed restrictions reflect this.

- 2.26 Although no attempt has been made to remove the School Keep Clear markings outside the disused part of the school, and indeed, the markings appear to have recently been refreshed, it has been highlighted that this School Keep Clear marking is actually disused. As a result, it is recommended that the proposals to support this particular School Keep Clear marking with a no waiting double yellow line have been dropped.

- 2.27 Furthermore, away from the current access to the school, it is recommended that the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings are supported by No Waiting Monday-Friday 8am-6pm single yellow lines rather than No Waiting At Any Time double yellow lines, to increase the availability of parking outside the school opening period.

- 2.28 Concerns about traffic speeds in Boxgrove Lane have been raised with the appropriate department of Surrey County Council and also Surrey Police.

- 2.29 The recommended revised proposals to be Made as an Order, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

**Chantry View Road (Guildford)**

- 2.30 Six representations have been received from 6 addresses about the proposals in the above location (see **ANNEXE 6.4\***).



- 2.31 The issues raised in the representations are, in the main, concerned about the loss of convenient, free short-stay parking close to Guildford town centre.
- 2.32 The proposed removal of part of one of the parking bays in Chantry View Road has been done at the request of Surrey County Council. This request relates to a residential building development in the vicinity. It was identified that the northern end of the parking bay would conflict with ability of large vehicles, such as refuse trucks, to access the new development. As a result, it is proposed that the northern extents of the parking bay be curtailed.
- 2.33 Despite this loss of parking space, 48 of the current 51 spaces within Chantry View Road will remain available for users. It is also the case that there is usually significant spare capacity within the spaces elsewhere in Chantry View Road, albeit that these may not be as close to the town centre as the ones being lost.
- 2.34 The recommended proposals to be Made as an Order, and unchanged from those formally advertised, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**.

**East Horsley - Various**

- 2.35 1 representation has been received from East Horsley Parish Council about the proposals in the above location (see **ANNEXE 6.5\***).
- 2.36 The Parish Council are generally supportive of the proposals to enhance and relocate the parking facilities within the village for Blue Badge Holders, and bolster the level of restriction in Ockham Road South, in the vicinity of the Station Approach / Cobham Way junction. However, they have highlighted that the pharmacy in Kingston Avenue, for which a disabled space has been proposed, is relocating. Therefore, it is suggested that the need for such a facility in that particular is no longer required.
- 2.37 Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal to introduce a formalised Disabled Only parking space in Kingston Avenue is dropped.
- 2.38 The recommended revised proposals to be Made as an Order, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

**Egerton Road (Guildford)**

- 2.39 One representation has been received from 1 address about the proposals in the above location (see **ANNEXE 6.6\***).
- 2.40 The representation highlights to loss of non-peak time parking in the vicinity of the Royal Surrey County Hospital, Surrey Sports Centre and Research Park. The representee goes on to suggest that the instead of No Waiting At

Any Time restrictions, peak time restrictions operating over an extended period more closely matching the present 'rush hours'.

- 2.41 The proposed conversion of the existing peak time single yellow line waiting restriction in Egerton Road to a No Waiting At Any Time waiting restriction has been done at the request of Surrey County Council. This request relates to the re-engineering of the Egerton Road access / junction with the Royal Surrey County Hospital, Surrey Sports Centre and Research Park. In order to maximise the benefit of the road widening / junction improvement scheme, the complete removal of parking on the southern side of the east-west section of Egerton Road is preferred.
- 2.42 The recommended proposals to be Made as an Order, and unchanged from those formally advertised, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**.

**Kingfisher Drive (Merrow)**

- 2.43 Ten representations have been received from 10 addresses about the proposals in the above location (see **ANNEXE 6.7\***).
- 2.44 Of these, 5 object to the proposals suggesting that there simply is not a need for such measures, and they may indeed be counter-productive. 4 generally support the need for controls of one form or another, although again, the potential knock-on effects are highlighted. 1 representation
- 2.45 The proposals in Kingfisher Drive have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around the Kingfisher Drive and Old Merrow Street junctions. Indeed, the presence of parked vehicles was highlighted as a contributory factor in a personal injury accident in Kingfisher Drive. As explained in para.2.3, however, the scope of the measures was extended to mitigate against the potential for parking to displace around nearby junctions.
- 2.46 Although some suggest that there isn't a parking issue to resolve, parking in the vicinity of the primary junctions being considered can be an issue. However, some of the representees who suggest that there is not a parking problem then go onto suggest that if measures are introduced around those junctions and, and mitigating measures are introduced around others in the vicinity, that this may the cause issues. Clearly, if the levels of parking are such that they don't cause issues, the potential displacement is also likely to be minimal, and therefore the mitigating measures around the other junctions are likely to have little impact on the availability of parking.
- 2.47 The speed of traffic using Kingfisher Drive is raised repeatedly within the representations. This issue has been forwarded to the appropriate department within Surrey County Council and also Surrey Police. However, in respect to the proposed restrictions, large sections of kerb space away from the junctions will remain available for parking. The fact that parking will continue to occur, rather than being removed entirely mean that it continue to have a traffic calming effect, whilst visibility around the junctions

will also be improved. Although it is not envisaged that significantly more parking will occur within the carriageway on the north side of the road, if this were to occur, the pinch points / chicane effects that this may create away from the junctions may actually assist in tempering traffic speeds.

- 2.48 The proposals are not intended to specifically deal with the school-run periods, although obviously it is hoped that they will assist in this regard. The position and extents of the proposed restrictions reflect this, the fact that Kingfisher Drive is a major estate road, bus route and close to various facilities, such as the school, surgery and shops.
- 2.49 The possible increase in use of the bus stop lay-by opposite the Kingfisher Drive by vehicles other than buses has been raised as a potential issue. Concerns have also been raised about the position of a bus stop elsewhere within Kingfisher Drive. Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group may wish to consider these issues, and also the possibility of introducing a bus stop clearway designation orders with the appropriate signs and road markings. This would allow Parking Services' officers to enforce the controls whilst patrolling the nearby formalised restrictions and help deter motorists avoiding the latter from encroaching upon the bus stops.
- 2.50 The recommended proposals to be Made as an Order, and unchanged from those formally advertised, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**.

**Lower Road (Effingham)**

- 2.51 Five representations have been received from 5 addresses about the proposals in the above location, including the head teacher of Howard of Effingham school (see **ANNEXE 6.8\***).
- 2.52 The head teacher of the school does not object to the proposals as they will improve access and will allow a degree of parking to continue, thereby calming traffic. Effingham Parish Council are generally supportive of the proposals but thought minor, unspecified changes could result in improvements. 2 representations received from the residents of Effingham Place, whilst supportive of the principle behind the controls, believe that they do not go sufficiently far to prevent parking in the vicinity of their junction onto Lower Road. Another representation has been received from a governor of the school objecting to the extents of the controls, the loss of parking, and suggesting a whole raft of engineering measure to increase parking, provide pedestrian crossing facilities and calm traffic.
- 2.53 Although previous advisory white road markings have been used around the junctions and on the north side of the road, these have proved to be of limited benefit. The proposals in Lower Road have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around various junctions / major points of access on and off the public highway, and to protect the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings. As such, they are not intended to specifically deal with the school-run periods, although

obviously it is hoped that they will assist in this regard. The position and extents of the proposed restrictions reflect this.

- 2.54 Although not a classified road, Lower Road is a bus route, the site of a school and carries relatively high volumes of traffic during the rush-hour periods. Whilst the junctions with Effingham Place and Century Court only serve a relatively small number of properties, the respective set back distances proposed ensure left and right hand sightlines will be improved. However, the width of Lower Road in the vicinity of Effingham Place, combined with the use of the junction, is such that it is considered sufficient for it not to be necessary to introduce measures opposite the junction, thereby retaining parking.
- 2.55 The accesses to and from the school however are regularly used by coaches. For this reason, controls are considered necessary opposite these to facilitate improved the access and egress of such vehicles. Even so, following discussions with the local borough councillor, the need for the controls opposite the accesses to be No Waiting At Any Time double yellow line restrictions has been reassessed, in view of the use of these accesses outside the normal opening times of the school, and as a result, it is now recommended that No Waiting Monday-Friday 8am-6pm single yellow lines are introduced, to increase the availability of parking outside the school opening period.
- 2.56 A bus stop lay-by is present east of the eastern access of the school. During the school run, this is often used by parents to drop off and pick up pupils. On occasion, this activity may prevent the hourly bus service from Leatherhead from using the stop (6.30am-6pm). Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group may wish to consider the possibility of introducing a bus stop clearway designation order with the appropriate sign and road markings. This would allow Parking Services' officers to enforce the controls whilst patrolling the nearby formalised restrictions and help deter motorists avoiding the latter from encroaching upon the bus stop.
- 2.57 The recommended revised proposals to be Made as an Order, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

#### **Manor Road (Ash)**

- 2.58 One representation has been received from 1 address about the proposals in the above location (see **ANNEXE 6.9\***).
- 2.59 The representation suggests that the extents of the controls and their operational hours are excessive, and should be curtailed.
- 2.60 The proposals in Boxgrove Lane have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around various junctions and to protect the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings. As such, they are not intended to specifically deal with the school-run periods, although obviously it is hoped that they will assist in this regard.

- 2.61 Manor Road is a classified road, a bus route and the site of a school. Furthermore, it is also the site of a gymnasium, all weather sports facilities and tennis courts which at peak times generate on street parking outside the hours normally associated with a school. The position and extents of the proposed restrictions reflect this.
- 2.62 Although not specifically mentioned within the representation, as the location is on a bus route, and bus stops are situated in close proximity of the proposed controls, Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group may wish to consider this and the possibility of introducing a bus stop clearway designation order with the appropriate sign and road markings. This would allow Parking Services' officers to enforce the controls whilst patrolling the nearby formalised restrictions and help deter motorists avoiding the latter from encroaching upon the bus stops.
- 2.63 The recommended proposals to be Made as an Order, and unchanged from those formally advertised, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**.

**New Road (Chilworth)**

- 2.64 Twenty-eight representations have been received including 3 petitions. The 25 individual representations received have come from 18 addresses. 12 of the 25 making individual representations also signed a petition (see **ANNEXE 6.10\***).
- 2.65 The 3 petitions received include a 153-signature petition opposed to the proposals, a 29-signature petition opposed to the proposals and a 34-signature petition supporting the proposals.
- 2.66 The 153-signature petition from 124 identifiable addresses, was signed by a wide variety of people from various localities, although predominantly residents of New Road. The petition opposes the proposals due to the impact it is feared they will have on parking for residents, there having been problems with availability for at least the last 20 years during the rush hour, school run, in the evening and at weekends. Concerns have also been raised about the impact of reduced parking on the businesses in the village, and the ability of local elderly car-users to park close to these amenities. The impact of the proposals on parents involved in the school run is also highlighted, particularly now that the school buses have been discontinued.
- 2.67 The 29-signature petition, like the 153-signature petition above, objects to the proposals due to their impact on the availability of parking for residents. It too is signed by residents of New Road, and some of the adjacent roads. Concerns are raised about the lack of a viable alternative for residents, and that their parking in side roads and further afield will cause further congestion. It suggests that rather than parking controls, traffic calming / a 20mph zone should be considered in the vicinity of Tillingbourne School, and that the school itself should resolve the issues it causes. Furthermore, the petition suggests that the existing parking calms traffic, that any

reduction in parking will increase vehicle speeds and that 5-metre long restrictions are sufficient around the various junctions in the vicinity.

- 2.68 The 34-signature petition from 22 households was signed exclusively by residents of Lakes Close, expresses support for the proposed controls which protect this road's junction with New Road, and highlights an accident and several near misses at this particular junction.
- 2.69 The 25 individual representations generally mirror the views expressed in the petitions which oppose the proposals, citing concerns about the loss of parking for various user-groups, the lack of a viable alternative, and that the present levels of parking help temper excessive traffic speeds. The loss of the Pegasus bus service and other changes in the school run arrangements at Tillingbourne school also feature. Those residing in properties close to junctions, and the proposed restrictions, were particularly well represented.
- 2.70 The proposals in New Road have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around its junctions with Lakes Close and St Thomas Close, and to protect the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings outside Tillinbourne School. As such, they are not intended to specifically deal with the school-run periods, although obviously, it is hoped that they will assist in this regard. As explained in para.2.3, however, the scope of the measures were extended to mitigate against the potential displacement parking around nearby junctions in the vicinity, such as the junction of Chantry Road and various of the cul-de-sacs and accesses. The nature and extents of the various proposed restrictions are appropriate with the nature of New Road, it being a classified road, a bus route, the site of a school and with the various junctions off it.
- 2.71 The representations make various estimates about the loss of parking resulting from the proposed controls (18-21 spaces). However, the upper of these figures, in particular, appears to overlook the fact that some of the spaces identified may not actually be suitable. For example, around the New Road / Chantry Road junction, and the Serendipity shop, 10 metre of double yellow lines are proposed in Chantry Road and 20 metres in New Road. In this particular case, however, unless parking within 10 metres of a junction, across vehicle crossovers, or on a bus stop were considered acceptable, the introduction of the proposed measures would actually only result in the loss of 1 space available to all motorists.
- 2.72 In terms of the present parking activity, the greatest levels of parking by residents tend to occur in the evening and at weekends. The parking associated with the school run occurs during two distinct periods towards the beginning and end of weekdays, whilst that associated with the various shops is predominantly during the day. Therefore, the availability of parking for the shops would be largely unaffected by the controls during weekdays, as the pressure on parking from residents is comparatively low, and there is generally spare capacity in the vicinity at these times.

- 2.73 The speed of traffic using New Road is raised repeatedly within the representations. This issue has been forwarded to the appropriate department within Surrey County Council and also Surrey Police. However, in respect to the proposed restrictions, large sections of kerb space away from the bellmouths of the junctions will remain available for parking. The fact that it will still be possible to park between the proposed measures, rather than being removed entirely, means that parking will continue to have a traffic calming effect, whilst visibility around the junctions and accesses will be improved. Furthermore, the areas around the junctions where controls are present will provide opportunities to pull in, particularly for large vehicles at peak times.
- 2.74 Prior to the formal advertisement of proposals in New Road, no issues had been raised / requests for controls received for Dorking Road, Chilworth. The ad-hoc element of the review has primarily been based on unsolicited concerns raised previously. Furthermore, whilst the need for mitigating measures were identified elsewhere within New Road, the possible need for similar mitigating steps to be taken to the east of the level crossing, in Dorking Road, were not.
- 2.75 Having met with local borough and county councillors and considered the concerns raised within the various representations and petitions, scope to lessen the extents and nature of the restrictions have been identified at various of the proposed locations. It is now recommended that the School Keep Clear marking on the north side of New Road, opposite Tillingbourne School, away from the Lakes Close junction, is formalised using a No Waiting Monday-Friday 8am-6pm, single yellow line restriction, rather than a No Waiting At Any Time double yellow line restrictions. This will allow parking to take place on the north side of the road at times when the school isn't open and the pressure on parking from residents is at its greatest. At a number of the junctions serving cul-de-sacs with a lower number of properties the opportunity has also been taken to reduce the length of the controls on New Road. It is now recommended that the controls around Chantry Road, Surrey House, Copse Close and Brook Road have reduced extents whilst still maintaining visibility at these junctions.
- 2.76 A number of bus stops are present in the area, although perhaps the ones closest to the junction with Chantry Road are the most likely to be parked upon. On occasion, this activity may prevent the half-hourly bus service to / from Redhill (between 7am-7pm) from using the stop. Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group may wish to consider the possibility of introducing a bus stop clearway designation order with the appropriate sign and road markings. This would allow Parking Services' officers to enforce the controls whilst patrolling the nearby formalised restrictions and help deter motorists avoiding the latter from encroaching upon the bus stops.
- 2.77 The recommended revised proposals to be Made as an Order, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

**Ripley - Various**

- 2.78 4 representations have been received from 4 addresses about the proposals in the above location, including Ripley Parish Council (see **ANNEXE 6.11\***).
- 2.79 The Parish Council are supportive of the introduction of the Disabled Parking Bay in the southern service road off the High Street. However, it objects to the removal to park of the parking bay in Rose Lane. It also objects to the loss of parking in Newark Lane, particularly due to the increase in illegal parking on The Common. 2 representations from the properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposals in Rose Lane have written to confirm that they no longer had any intention of bringing the disused vehicle crossover back into use. A representation has also been received from the property in the immediate vicinity of the proposed change in Newark Lane objecting to it.
- 2.80 In respect of the additional Disabled Parking Bay, although this effectively reduces the availability of limited waiting parking within the southern service road, the request was made by the Parish Council.
- 2.81 The request to revise the parking bay in Rose Lane was made by the previous resident of Cedar House, who on selling the property, suggested that the new resident wished to recommence using the parking facilities at the address, and therefore wanted to be able to use the disused vehicle crossover which is currently situated adjacent to a formalised parking bay. On the basis of the representations received clearly their intentions have changed.
- 2.82 In respect to the proposed change in Newark Lane, elsewhere within the Ripley controlled parking zone, all points of private accesses are protected by formalised parking controls, either single or double yellow lines, depending on the circumstances. At around the time the controls were originally extended in Newark Lane, it became evident that building development work had resulted in the creation of two new vehicle crossovers immediately adjacent to one of the two unrestricted parking bays. As a stop-gap, until such time that the formalised restrictions could be changed, an Advisory Protection Marking (APM) was introduced, to highlight the presence of these points of access. However, it was always the intention to amend the controls to prevent unrestricted parking by any motorist adjacent to the vehicle crossovers. Indeed, the new development referred to by the representee may increase the likelihood of such an event occurring.
- 2.83 The concerns about the impact of the new residential development on the availability of parking have been forwarded to the appropriate departments of Guildford Borough and Surrey County Councils.



- 2.84 In view of the representations received, it is now recommended that the proposal for Rose Lane is abandoned, but that the other proposals proceed.
- 2.85 The recommended revised proposals to be Made as an Order, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

**Shawfield Road / Winchester Road (Ash)**

- 2.86 3 representations have been received from 3 addresses about the proposals in the above location (see **ANNEXE 6.12\***).
- 2.87 One of the representations supports the proposals but makes the request to increase the extents of one of the double yellow lines by a metre or so, to fully protect their vehicle crossover. Another of the representations requests that additional controls are introduced within the cul-de-sac end to protect their vehicle crossover at all times, whilst another questions the need for the parking controls to operate at all times when the issues are primarily caused during the school-run period.
- 2.88 The proposals in Shawfield Road / Winchester Road have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around various junctions in the vicinity of the school. As such, they are not intended to specifically deal with the school-run periods, although obviously it is hoped that they will assist in this regard. The position and extents of the proposed restrictions reflect this, the controls operating at all times to prevent parking in close proximity to junctions, and where in reality, no parking should be taking place at any time. Clearly, if the pressure on parking space outside the school period is much reduced, there won't be a need to park on the At Any Time controls in any case.
- 2.89 In respect to the request made by the resident of No.208 Shawfield Road, whilst ordinarily 'one-off' controls are not specifically designed to protect individual private points of access onto the highway, and any increase in the extents or period of control of the proposed restrictions would generally require re-advertisement, as the increase in the length of the double yellow lines to fully protect their driveway would be less than 2 metres, such a change constitutes a very minor amendment, and therefore re-advertisement would not be necessary. Therefore it is recommended that the No Waiting At Any Time double yellow lines on the northern side of Winchester Road adjacent to No.208 Shawfield Road be extended very slightly eastwards. By contrast, the introduction of a significant length of controls to protect the cul-de-sac end would require re-advertisement. Therefore, it is not recommended that additional controls be considered within the cul-de-sac at this time.

2.90 The recommended revised proposals to be Made as an Order, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

**Shere - Various**

2.91 13 representations have been received from 13 addresses about the proposals in the above location, including Shere Parish Council (see **ANNEXE 6.13\***).

2.92 Shere Parish Council fully support the proposals on the proviso the conservation road markings are used. Another representation generally objects to the proposals due to the lack of parking in the village and the impact that the lengths of restriction will have on this.

2.93 The proposals in Shere have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around various junctions, and to protect the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings outside Shere School.

2.94 In respect to the proposals in Lower Street, 1 representation is generally supportive of the proposals although it suggests that the proposed controls are not extensive enough. Particular concern is raised about the issue of footway parking at Lower Street's junction with Orchard Road. 8 representations (including 7 'standard letters') object to the proposal on the basis that it constitutes a significant loss of space for residents, when parking situation is already complicated by visitors to the village. Furthermore, they suggest that the road should be subject to prioritisation measures for residents, whilst other representation suggests that the current parking helps reduce traffic speed.

2.95 The proposals were specifically developed in this location after incidents where large vehicles avoiding vehicles parked opposite have hit the Old Forge. Whilst some residents, particularly those in the cottages opposite may feel that their parking is considerate, if larger vehicles, such as emergency service, refuse or delivery vehicles, are required to negotiate this section of road, issues could result. The proposed measures protect the area around the Old Forge and the adjacent junction with Orchard Road. Furthermore, the proposed restrictions at the bellmouth of Orchard Road would apply across the adjacent footway.

2.96 With regard to the proposals in Gomshall Lane, 1 representation was received. Although generally supportive of the measures to reduce congestion within the village, and particularly around Gomshall Lane's junction with Middle Street, the representee is concerns about the impact the controls in the vicinity of their home will have on their own ability to park conveniently.

2.97 The proposed controls in Gomshall Lane will still allow motorists to park sensibly away from the junction with Middle Street and the access to the museum / village hall. The latter will also help protect an existing bus stop,

although Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group may wish to consider the possibility of introducing a bus stop clearway designation order with the appropriate sign and road markings. This would allow Parking Services' officers to enforce the controls whilst patrolling the nearby formalised restrictions and help deter motorists avoiding the latter from encroaching upon the bus stop. The controls proposed to protect the existing advisory School Keep Clear marking were not commented upon, although in view of the concerns raised about the loss of space, it is now recommended that these is formalised using a No Waiting Monday-Friday 8am-6pm, single yellow line restriction, rather than a No Waiting At Any Time double yellow line restrictions. This will allow parking to take place on the south side of the road at times when the school isn't open and the pressure on parking from residents is generally at its greatest.

- 2.98 A representation has also been received about the proposed controls in Middle Street from the shop owner whose property is situated on the junction with Gomshall Lane. The representee suggests that the existing physical measures at the junction, which are intended to prevent damage to the premises are ineffective, and the removal of parking within this area will further expose the property to damage. Concerns are also raised about the resultant loss of parking and the difficulties the restrictions may pose for deliveries.
- 2.99 Parking close to junctions can actually inhibit turning manoeuvres and may exacerbate issues. Parking within 10 metres of a junction is not advisable even in a lightly trafficked residential road. The proposed restrictions in Middle Street are consistent with attempting to prevent parking in such areas. However, loading and unloading is still permitted on yellow lines provided danger or obstruction is not being caused. Parking will still be permitted on the east side of the road between the measures protecting the junction with Gomshall Lane and those protecting the vehicular access to Forrest Place, the blocking of which has raised concerns previously.
- 2.100 Concerns about security within the village car park have been forwarded to the Parish Council and appropriate department of the Borough Council. The concerns raised about the lack of effective physical measures at the junction of Middle Street and Gomshall Lane have been forwarded to the appropriate department of the County Council.
- 2.101 The recommended revised proposals to be Made as an Order, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

#### **Southway (Guildford)**

- 2.102 One representation has been received from 1 address about the proposals in the above location (see **ANNEXE 6.14\***).
- 2.103 The representation from the Chairman of Governors at Guildford Grove School fully supported the proposals.

2.104 The recommended proposals to be Made as an Order, and unchanged from those formally advertised, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**.

**Stratford Road (Ash Vale)**

- 2.105 Thirty representations have been received including 1 SCC E-petition. The 29 individual representations received have come from 24 identifiable properties / households, including one from Holly Lodge School. 9 of the 29 making individual representations have also signed the E-petition, and 21 of the individual representations take the form a 'standard letter' (see **ANNEXE 6.15\***).
- 2.106 The 104-signature SCC E-petition objects to the proposals and requests that they are withdrawn to reduce the strain on the adjacent roads, the Carrington Lane car park and the school drop-off facility. It also suggests that the existing restrictions in Meadow Close should be removed.
- 2.107 Twenty-five of the 29 individual representations, including the 21 'standard letters' also object to the proposals on the basis that they will reduce the availability of parking space, and cause parents and pupils to have to walk further, thereby increasing danger. It is also suggested that the proposed restrictions will increase vehicle speeds in Stratford Road, again increasing danger, and cause displacement into adjacent roads. Others suggest that a greater amount of parking on both sides of the road worsening the present situation. Furthermore the representations suggest that traffic calming and pedestrian crossing facilities should be considered and the Carrington Lane car park greatly expanded. Some representees also suggest that the drop-off facility should be closed as queuing and turning into it cause issues. Another suggests that improved lowered kerb facilities should be provided for pedestrians.
- 2.108 Holly Lodge School's representation doesn't refer specifically to the proposed parking controls but instead suggests that any measures to enhance road safety should be considered, including flashing school signs on the approaches to the school, pedestrian crossing facilities and traffic calming measures.
- 2.109 4 representations are generally supportive of the need for formalised parking controls. Even so, 2 of these representations suggest additional measures should be considered, specifically during the school-run periods, to resolve the issues that occur at these times, and to minimise the loss of parking for residents and their visitors at other times. Concerns are also raised about the possible increase of verge parking.
- 2.110 The proposals in Stratford Road have primarily been developed to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues around various junctions / bend and to protect the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings. As such, they are not intended to specifically deal with the school-run periods, although obviously it is hoped that they will assist in this regard. The position and

extents of the proposed restrictions reflect the fact that Stratford Road is a classified road, a bus route and the site of a school.

- 2.111 Parking will still remain available away from these key locations, and boarding and alighting will still be permitted on these restrictions, provided danger or obstruction are not caused. As such, their presence may improve the turn-over of vehicles in these locations.
- 2.112 The fact that it will still be possible to park between the proposed measures, rather than being removed entirely, means that parking will continue to have a traffic calming effect, whilst visibility around the junctions and accesses will be improved. Furthermore, the restriction of parking around the junctions and where the other controls are present will provide enhanced opportunities for passing, particularly at peak times.
- 2.113 Controls operating at all times prevent parking in close proximity to junctions / bends, and where in reality, no parking should be taking place at any time. The proposed measures protecting Cordelia Gardens and The Beeches are longer than they might otherwise be the case due to their positioning on the inside of the bend, the longer setback distances enhancing left and right hand visibility. Clearly, as the pressure on parking space outside the school period is much reduced, there won't be a need to park in the vicinity of the At Any Time controls in any case and the significant lengths of kerb space that remain uncontrolled will be available for parking.
- 2.114 Where formalised parking controls are present, these apply across the full width of the public highway so it will be possible to take enforcement action against any parking on verges adjacent to the formalised controls.
- 2.115 Although unmarked, it is proposed that the bus stop is controlled by formalised controls, its position coinciding with the most suitable location for a passing place between Cordelia Gardens and the northern most access to the school. Even so, Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group may wish to consider the possibility of introducing a bus stop clearway designation order with the appropriate sign and road markings at this stop and others in the vicinity.
- 2.116 Nevertheless, following discussion with local borough and county councillors, it is now recommended that the controls proposed to protect the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings and the bus stop, are formalised using a No Waiting Monday-Friday 8am-6pm, single yellow line restriction, rather than a No Waiting At Any Time double yellow line restrictions, to increase the availability of parking outside the school time period.
- 2.117 The requests for traffic calming, improved pedestrian facilities, including crossing, improved signing and the expansion of the Carrington Lane car park have been forwarded to the Parish Council, and the appropriate departments of the Borough and County Councils.

2.118 The recommended revised proposals to be Made as an Order, are shown in **ANNEXE 7**, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

### **Other Proposals**

2.119 Although no representations were received regarding the 12 other proposals, discussion with local borough and county councillors raised a few issues, which although outside the scope of the this parking review, have been forwarded to the appropriate departments of the Borough and County Councils.

2.120 Additionally, in respect to formalising the Disabled Parking Bay outside the former Post Office premises in Shawfield Road, the parking facility there was provided by the County Council to meet the needs of a particular resident. Further investigations now suggest that the person for which the bay was introduced now no longer resides there. Therefore, it is now recommended that the formalisation proposals be dropped, and indeed, Surrey County Council are taking steps to remove this advisory bay. The recommended revised proposals in this locality to be Made as an Order, are shown in ANNEXE 7, with the revisions from the formally advertised proposals annotated in red, as opposed to blue.

2.121 The other recommended proposals for which no representations were received to be Made as an Order, and unchanged from those formally advertised, are shown in ANNEXE 7.

## **3 OPTIONS**

3.1 The process of making an order is governed by regulation and the Committee is required to consider the objections and comments made.

3.2 It is recommended that the Committee agree the recommendations made by officers to make the order and introduce the restrictions shown in **ANNEXE 7**.

3.3 The Committee could agree minor amendments that were less restrictive in nature than the original proposals.

3.4 The Committee could agree to implement the proposals in part or not implement the proposals and consider a different form of scheme. Producing new proposals and re-consulting on them would take considerable time and would impact on other work and in particular the progress of the ongoing Control Parking Zone review.

3.5 As this is a legal process it would be useful if any member of the committee who wishes to propose an amendment or to implement the

scheme in part could make the officers aware prior to the meeting so appropriate legal advice can be obtained.

#### **4    CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 Following this meeting, if the recommendation is agreed it is proposed to Make the Orders necessary to implement the proposals shown in **ANNEXE 7**, and write to all those that made formal representations notifying them of the decision at around the time the Order is made, as statutorily required.

#### **5    FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The cost consolidating the Town Non-Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone and Parished Areas orders is estimated to be in the region of £6,000.
- 5.2 The cost of consulting and implementing the geographic element of the review in Ashenden, Park Barn, Slyfield, Stoughton and Westborough, and those associated with the initial and full assessments of the ad-hoc requests, the subsequent development of proposals, formal advertisement and implementation will not exceed the £50,000 estimated and budgeted.
- 5.3 All the above costs can be funded from the CPZ on-street account.

#### **6    EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 Reviewing the need for the introduction of formalised disabled bays on an annual basis, and regardless of locality, will improve accessibility for blue badge holders. Otherwise, there are no equality or diversity implications.

#### **7    CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

#### **8    CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 8.1 That the proposals detailed in **ANNEXE 7** are implemented and traffic regulation order made.

#### **9    REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 9.1 The proposed controls will ensure easier traffic flow, particularly around junctions and promote a better balance in the use of kerbside space.

## 10 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

10.1 Advertise the Made Order for the proposals shown in **ANNEXE 7** and implement the controls.

**COUNTY OFFICER:** David Curl, Parking Strategy & Implementation Team  
Manager

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 03456 009 009

**E-MAIL:** [david.curl@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:david.curl@surreycc.gov.uk)

**LEAD OFFICER:** Kevin McKee, Parking Services Manager

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 01483 444530

**E-MAIL:** [kevin.mckee@guildford.gov.uk](mailto:kevin.mckee@guildford.gov.uk)

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Andrew Harkin, On Street Parking Co-ordinator

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 01483 444535

**E-MAIL:** [andrew.harkin@guildford.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.harkin@guildford.gov.uk)

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** Local Committee (Guildford) - 30 September 2009, Item 10 & Minute 45/09  
Local Committee (Guildford) – 23 June 2010, Item 15 & Minute 35/10  
Local Committee (Guildford) – 22 September 2010, Item 14 & Minute 53/10  
Local Committee (Guildford) – 9 March 2011, Item 13 & Minute 91/10  
Local Committee (Guildford) – 22 June 2011, Item 16 & Minute 16/11

Version No. 6      Date: 6-3-12      Time: 02:45      Initials: APH      No of annexes: 7\*

\* Public representations at **ANNEXE 6** can be found on the Surrey County Council website. Hard copies will be available at the meeting and also for consultation at Guildford Borough Council Reception.