



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

**GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE
CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE
REVIEW**

13 JUNE 2012

KEY ISSUE

This report presents proposals for improving the regulation of parking in a number of areas both within and in the vicinity of the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ).

SUMMARY

As part of the cyclical review of parking issues, it is the turn of issues within the CPZ to be considered. This report presents the feedback associated with a number of informal consultations undertaken following the September 2011 meeting of the Committee.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree :

- (i) to consult further with properties in the area of Onslow village shown in **ANNEXE 2** about the possibility of an extension to the CPZ as shown in **ANNEXE 5**,
- (ii) to develop proposals, in consultation with local ward and divisional members, to amend the existing parking controls in the

Dene Road area, and to conduct any further informal consultation with residents as considered appropriate,

- (iii) to formally advertise the proposals shown in **ANNEXE 10** at the appropriate stage during the review cycle, with a view to including Rivermount Gardens within the Guildford town centre CPZ, and to consider any formal representations received accordingly,
- (iv) to develop proposals, in consultation with local ward and divisional members, to introduce limited parking controls in the St Lukes area, and to conduct any further informal consultation with residents as considered appropriate,
- (v) to report the feedback associated with the ongoing consultations in the Millmead, Warwicks Bench and Woodbridge Road areas back to the September meeting of the Committee,

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 within the CPZ was completed in May 2010. The most recent review, dealing with issues outside the CPZ, is nearing completion, with changes either having, or in the process of being implemented.
- 1.3 During the last review of the CPZ the zone was extended to the east of the town centre to include St Omer, Tangier and Warren Roads. Various boundary changes were also introduced to increase the opportunities for those living in particularly heavily parked areas to find a space. A number of other amendments were made to deal with recently created vehicle crossovers and to accommodate the introduction of disabled only parking places outside residential properties.
- 1.4 Residents and businesses within the central CPZ were also consulted about the possibility of the controls and prioritisation measures being extended to include Sundays. While there was not sufficient support to progress proposals, a number of amendments were introduced to bolster the restrictions where parking on Sundays caused safety, access and traffic flow issues.
- 1.5 An ongoing feature of the correspondence received from residents about the permit scheme is that, in some locations, permit eligibility is too restrictive (Area D), whilst in others, it is too relaxed (Areas A, B & C). Generally, in the zones surrounding the town centre, the ratio of permits to spaces is around 1.0-1.3. In a restricted area where controls operate during the day a certain number of residents are likely to be away from their home at any one time and these ratios are not excessive. The ratio of permits to spaces has remained fairly constant over the last 5 years. The proposals later in the report to consult on the introduction of pay and display in certain areas where residents parking is under pressure will help to create more space for permit holders in these areas.
- 1.6 Some residents also suggest the controlled hours of the scheme should be altered, some wanting extended hours, whilst others want a shorter period of restriction. Previous reviews have considered these issues, and consultation has suggested that (Dene Road aside in respect to the operational hours) there is not a clear desire amongst residents to see changes to either control hours or permit eligibility.

- 1.7 At its September 2011 meeting the Committee agreed the scope of the review. It was agreed to consider the possibility of the following:
- Controls / possible extension of CPZ further into Onslow Village,
 - Controls / possible extension of CPZ into Rivermount Gardens,
 - Controls / possible extension of CPZ into in St Lukes Square development,
 - Extension of the control hours / amendment of restrictions in the vicinity of G-Live,
 - Extension of Pay & Display parking controls / operational hours of control in the Woodbridge Road area of Area A, and Millmead area of Area B,
 - Extension of Pay & Display parking controls into Warwicks Bench,
 - Controls / possible extension of CPZ at the top of The Mount associated with possible engineering works,
 - Review of the previous extension of CPZ into St Omer Road, Tangier Road and Warren Road & other controls in the vicinity,
 - On street Car Club spaces,
 - Various other essential changes to parking bays and waiting restrictions
- 1.8 During December-January 2011/2 residents and businesses in Onslow Village and Rivermount Gardens were consulted about parking and possible measures to resolve any issues experienced.
- 1.9 During March-April 2012 residents and businesses in the Dene Road area of central Guildford and the St Lukes development were consulted about parking and possible measures to resolve any issues experienced.
- 1.10 This report presents the feedback associated with these informal consultations and recommends possible courses of action in each case.
- 1.11 Informal consultations regarding the possibility of extending the control hours / introducing pay and display parking in the Woodbridge Road area of Area A and the Millmead area of Area B, and the possible extension of pay and display parking into Warwicks Bench, are ongoing. These are due to be reported to the September 2012 meeting of the Committee, along with various other consultations / proposals.

2 ANALYSIS

Onslow Village consultation

- 2.1 Residents in the uncontrolled part of Onslow Village have complained about growing levels of commuter parking and the issues this causes, primarily in respect to safety and access.
- 2.2 All properties in the area shown in **ANNEXE 2** were invited to complete a questionnaire, which asked them whether they considered there to be

a need for new parking restrictions in their area, and if so, the nature of the controls they wish to see introduced. The questionnaire is shown in **ANNEXE 3**. A summary of the responses is shown in **ANNEXE 4**.

- 2.3 In total, 53% of properties canvassed responded to the questionnaire survey. Responses were received from 16 of the 17 roads consulted. No responses were received from the business properties addressed on the A3 – Guildford Bypass , at the western end of Manor Way.
- 2.4 Overall, 42% of respondents agreed that they experienced parking problems. In 5 roads of the 17 roads a 'clear majority' (60% or more in agreement) of respondents agreed that they experienced parking problems. 3 roads expressed a 'mixed' views (40-59% in agreement) about whether respondents experienced parking problems. Less than 40% of respondents agreed that they experienced parking problems in 8 roads.
- 2.5 When considered in isolation, overall 35% of respondents agreed that they wanted their road to be subject to parking controls of some sort. A 'clear majority' of respondents in 3 of the 17 roads surveyed (Ellis Avenue, The Crossways and West Meads) agreed that parking controls of some sort should be introduced. Opinions in 4 roads were 'mixed', and in 9 roads, less than 40% of respondents agreed that controls should be introduced.
- 2.6 When the possibility of adjacent roads being subject to controls was considered, overall 49% of respondents agreed that they wanted their road to be subject to parking controls of some sort. The number of roads where a 'clear majority' of respondents agreed with the introduction of parking controls of some sort doubled to 6 (Bannisters Road, Farnham Road [off Manor Way] and Wilderness Road adding clear support). In these circumstances, the number of roads where opinions were 'mixed' increased to 5, and the number of roads where less than 40% of respondents that controls should be introduced reduced to 5.
- 2.7 In terms of the nature of the controls that respondents would prefer to see should they be introduced in their road, overall 39% preferred limited controls, with 33% preferring CPZ measures. A 'clear majority' of respondents in 3 roads wanted their road to become part of the CPZ. This view was also expressed by the largest minority of respondent in a further 3 roads, albeit that it was a 'mixed' response. Limited controls were preferred in a further 6 roads, albeit that it was a 'mixed' response. Even in the 5 roads where less than 40% of respondents supported the introduction of controls in their road, if adjacent road were subject to controls, the largest proportion of respondents would prefer to see limited controls.
- 2.8 Officers have met with local ward members to discuss the findings. Members are keen for those roads exhibiting a preference supporting

inclusion within the CPZ to be included and have suggested that the CPZ should be extended to encompass all roads from the existing boundary up to Manor Way's junction with Abbots Close. The possible extents beyond the existing CPZ boundary are shown in **ANNEXE 5**.

- 2.9 When the feedback specifically from the area proposed in **ANNEXE 5** is considered, again the response is 'mixed'. 53% of respondents suggest they experience parking problems, 46% agree their road should be included in isolation, rising to 57% if adjacent roads were included. In terms of what should be done, 42% suggested their road should be included within an extension to the CPZ, with 27% preferring limited controls. The responses from this area are more supportive of measures than the wider consultation area. It is also the case that a significant minority of respondents prefer their road's inclusion within the CPZ. However, one also has to be mindful that, in such circumstances, those supportive of a CPZ, would almost certainly prefer limited controls to doing nothing, whereas the opposite might not necessarily be true.
- 2.10 Therefore, in an attempt to provide greater clarity, it is recommended that a further round of informal consultation is undertaken, asking properties whether they specifically want their road to be included within the CPZ. Although the proposed extents of the CPZ is limited to all roads up to Manor Way's junctions with Abbots Close, the views of all the properties originally consulted, including those beyond the proposed CPZ boundary, will be sought.
- 2.11 Furthermore, it is recommended to consult further with ward and divisional members about the findings of this additional consultation, before developing specific proposals. These will be reported back to a future meeting of the Committee to seek authority to conduct further informal consultation, or to formally advertise the proposals, depending on the nature of the controls subsequently developed.

Extension of the control hours / amendment of restrictions in the vicinity of G-Live

- 2.12 A petition has previously been received from 52 properties in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens requesting an extension of parking controls to 9.00pm and the introduction of controls on Sunday because of concern about the impact of G Live.
- 2.13 All properties in these roads and a number of roads in the surrounding area (as shown in **ANNEXE 6**) were invited to complete a questionnaire. This asked whether they would consider there to be a need to revise the existing parking restrictions in their area, and if so, the nature of the changes. The questionnaire is shown in **ANNEXE 7**. A summary of the responses is shown in **ANNEXE 8**.
- 2.14 Aside from Dene Road and Eastgate Gardens, where 46% and 28% of properties responded to the questionnaire survey, respectively,

response rates from the remainder of the roads were relatively modest (3-12%), resulting in an overall response rate of 17%.

- 2.15 Nevertheless, a 'clear majority' (60% or more) of respondents in 5 of the 6 roads consulted agreed that they experienced parking problems. A 'clear majority' of respondents in 3 of the 6 roads (Dene Road, Eastgate Gardens & Eastgate House) also agreed that the problems were mainly caused by non-residents. Respondents in 2 of the 3 remaining roads gave 'mixed' response (40-59% in agreement) to this.
- 2.16 Those that responded in agreement to non-residents mainly being the cause of the problems were then asked to indicate when the issues occurred. A 'clear majority' in 4 of the 6 roads indicated that they were the cause between 6-9pm Monday- Saturday. This is outside the present operational hours of the parking bays and single yellow line controls. A 'clear majority' of responses in 3 of the 6 roads also indicated that non-residents were also the main cause of issues between 6-9pm on Sundays. Again, this is outside the present operational hours of the parking bay and single yellow line controls. During the day on Sundays, when only the double yellow lines presently operate, concerns were also expressed about non-resident parking at those times, albeit a mixed response overall.
- 2.17 When asked whether the operational hours of the controls should be changed, a 'clear majority' in 5 out of the 6 road consulted indicated that they should be, with 82% in favour of changes overall. In terms of the times that those responding suggested the controls should operate, there was a general consensus that the control hours should be extended. Indeed, a few wanted the prioritisation measures to operate at all times. When analysed in greater detail, whilst most generally thought that the existing 8.30am start time of the controls was adequate, Monday-Saturday, a desire was expressed to extend the operational hours in the evenings to around 9pm, to cover the times when a 'clear majority' suggested problems were caused by non-residents. This was also the case for Sundays. Additionally, on Sundays, there was also a general desire expressed for the control hours to operate throughout the day, as they currently do Monday-Saturday.
- 2.18 In terms of other possible changes to the controls to resolve safety, access and traffic flow issues, rather than those relating to the availability of space, again a 'clear majority' of respondents expressed a desire for change. Particular concerns were raised about the parking which takes place on the existing single yellow lines in London Road and Epsom Road, outside their present hours of operation, and the issues this causes.
- 2.19 In view of the feedback, it is recommended that the operational hours of the controls in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens are changed to Monday-Sunday 8.30am-9pm. By prioritising the bays until

9pm, the issues experienced later on in the evening and overnight should also be addressed, as it is unlikely that significant numbers of non-residents will arrive after 9pm. Introducing controls during both the day and evening on Sundays will address the availability issues experienced at those times. Even so, it is not considered appropriate to re-proportion the parking bays from pay and display shared-use to permit-only.

- 2.20 Although a similar desire for change was expressed from those that responded in York Road and London Road, in view of the low response rate, it is not recommended that the operational hours of these bays are changed. In any case, the parking bays in London Road, these are pay and display only, with no prioritisation for permit-holders. Nevertheless, it is recommended that some lengths of the existing single yellow lines in Epsom Road and London Road into double yellow lines, to resolve the safety, access and traffic flow issues there.
- 2.21 However, there are a number of ways in which the changes in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens can be achieved, in terms of signing, due to it being a distinct area. There are also opportunities to change the nature of some of the controls, with the possibility of converting some existing lengths of yellow line into parking bays within Dene Road, due to the revised access arrangements associated with the G-Live. Conversely there are opportunities to bolster the protection of some of the existing vehicle accesses by converting single yellow lines to double yellow lines.
- 2.22 Therefore, officers recommend that further consultation with ward and divisional members about the specifics of the proposals developed and to conduct any further informal consultation with residents, as considered appropriate. The findings of this will report this back to a future meeting of the Committee to seek authority to formally advertise the proposals.

Controls / possible extension of CPZ into Rivermount Gardens

- 2.23 Correspondence has been received from some residents asking for controls in Rivermount Gardens and possibly an extension of the CPZ to include the road. However, other residents have, in the past, been opposed to controls.
- 2.24 Officers met with residents in December 2011 to assess the strength of feeling, and discuss the options available. Residents were asked to complete and questionnaire and fill in a plan to identify their preferred solution. A summary of their responses appears in **ANNEX 9**.
- 2.25 Responses were received from 16 of the 19 properties (14 being from identifiable addresses). A clear majority of properties wanted all kerb space within the road to be controlled by one form of restriction or another. The only variables were the extents of the double yellow lines at the junction with Portsmouth Road, the nature of the single yellow

lines elsewhere within the road, and the restrictions controlling the use of the parking bays situated within the lay-bys.

- 2.26 Therefore, on the basis of the feedback, it is recommended that the area becomes part of the CPZ, within the Area G permit catchment area. Furthermore it is recommended that parking within the lay-bys becomes 2-hour limited waiting shared-use and that the single yellow line restrictions operate Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm, like the remainder of the CPZ in the surrounding area. An outline of the proposal is shown in **ANNEX 10**.
- 2.27 It is recommended to formally advertise the proposal shown in **ANNEXE 10**, at an appropriate stage during the review cycle. All residents within Rivermount Gardens will be contacted directly. Any representations received will either be reported back to a future meeting of the Committee for its consideration, or considered by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, local ward and divisional members and the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager.

Controls / possible extension of CPZ into the St Luke's development

- 2.28 Previously a resident from the 'lower' section of the St Luke's development has presented a summary of a petition, from 24 households, which indicated over 90% wanted some form of control, to resolve parking issues which have developed over the past couple of years. However, 24 households represents about 20% of the total households within that part of the development.
- 2.29 The residents' group representing the 'upper' section of the development, St Lukes Park Residents' Association, has previously expressed opposition to the introduction of controls there. The St Lukes Management Company, which represents property owners (both sitting and absent) in the 'lower' section of the development, has also previously expressed reservations about the introduction of controls. Residents in the 'lower' section of the development have subsequently formed a residents' group, the St Luke's Residents Association.
- 2.30 All properties in the area shown in **ANNEXE 11** were invited to complete a questionnaire, as were the St Lukes Residents Association, St Lukes Park Residents Association and St Lukes Management Company. The questionnaire asked whether they considered there to be a need for new parking restrictions in their area, and if so, the nature of the controls they wish to see introduced. The questionnaire is shown in **ANNEXE 12**. A summary of the responses is shown in **ANNEXE 13**.
- 2.31 In total, 49% of those canvassed responded to the questionnaire survey. Responses were received from both residents groups and the management company. Response rates varied from 33-64%, with all roads being represented. Around 11% of responses were submitted anonymously, or only including partial addresses. 39% of the properties

in the 'lower' section of the development responded, whilst in the 'upper' section, 47% responded.

- 2.32 Overall, there is a 'mixed' response, with 57% agreeing that they experienced parking problems. However, there was a marked split in opinion between the 'lower' section of the development, comprising of St Bartholomew's Court, Catherine's Park, St Luke's Square and St Thomas's Mews, and the 'upper' section of the development, comprising of Lancaster Avenue, Newlands Crescent and Sells Close.
- 2.33 In the 'lower' part of the development a 'clear majority' in all roads agreed they experienced parking problems (87% overall). In the 'upper' part of the development less than 40% of respondents in all roads agreed they experienced parking problems (26% overall).
- 2.34 When considered in isolation, overall 51% of respondents agreed that they wanted their road to be subject to parking controls of some sort. Once again, however, there was a marked split in opinion between the 'lower' and 'upper' sections of the development.
- 2.35 In the 'lower' part of the development a 'clear majority' in all roads agreed there road should be subject to parking controls of some sort (83% overall). In the 'upper' part of the development less than 40% of respondents in all roads agreed there road should be subject to parking controls of some sort (20% overall).
- 2.36 When the possibility of adjacent roads being subject to controls was considered, overall 59% of respondents agreed that they wanted their road to be subject to parking controls of some sort. Once again, however, there was a marked split in opinion between the 'lower' and 'upper' sections of the development.
- 2.37 In the 'lower' part of the development a 'clear majority' in all roads agreed there road should be subject to parking controls of some sort (83% overall). In the 'upper' part of the development less than 40% of respondents in all roads agreed there road should be subject to parking controls of some sort (32% overall).
- 2.38 In terms of the nature of the controls that respondents would prefer to see should they be introduced in their road, overall 56% preferred limited controls, and 21% preferring CPZ measures.
- 2.39 In the 'lower' part of the development a 'clear majority' in 3 of the 4 roads wanted their road to become subject to limited controls (60% overall). Even in the road that expressed a 'mixed' response, limited controls was the largest minority. 26% of respondents in the 'lower' section of the development wanted to become part of the adjacent CPZ.
- 2.40 Even in the 'upper' part of the development, where less than 40% of respondents in all roads agreed there road should be subject to parking

controls, if controls were to be introduced, overall 51% would prefer to see limited controls. 20% would prefer to see their road become part of the adjacent CPZ.

- 2.41 Although the temptation might be to only introduce limited parking controls in the 'lower' section of the development, where such controls are clearly wanted, experience elsewhere has suggested that even the modest introduction of limited controls can cause parking issues to displace into the next uncontrolled area, unless similar measures are introduced there to mitigate against potential issues arising. In the case of the 'upper' section of the development, there is already an existing demand on kerb space, particularly at the end closest to the 'lower' section of the development. Although this is generally accepted by those in the 'upper' section of the development, there is the potential for any displacement to occur around junctions and on bends elsewhere within the 'upper' part of the development.
- 2.42 Therefore, officers recommend that limited controls are introduced in both the 'lower' and 'upper' sections of the development, primarily to protect junctions, bends and other sensitive locations. Further consultation is recommended with ward and divisional members about the specifics of the proposals developed prior to conducting any further informal consultation with residents, as considered appropriate. The findings of this will report this back to a future meeting of the Committee to seek authority to formally advertise the proposals.

Various other possible changes to bays and restrictions

- 2.43 The consultations associated with the possible extension of operational hours of the parking scheme and pay and display parking in the Woodbridge Road area of Area A, Millmead area of Area B and the possible introduction of pay and display shared-use spaces in Warwicks Bench, closest to the existing pay and display spaces in the adjacent area, are ongoing. These are due to be reported to the September 2012 meeting of the Committee.
- 2.44 Similarly proposals to make changes to the Bridge Street Gyratory, Commercial Road, Cranley Road, Guildford Park Road, Josephs Road, Recreation Road, Warren Road, and various other changes to accommodate newly created vehicle crossovers and disabled spaces are also due to be reported to the September 2012 meeting. No progress appears to have been made in relation to the possible re-engineering of the highway at the top of The Mount, which could, if it came to fruition, result in the introduction of parking controls beyond the present CPZ boundary. However, during the review, it is possible that the redevelopment of the Farnham Road Hospital may require amendments to be made to the existing parking controls within the vicinity.

3 OPTIONS

- 3.1 There is a considerable amount of work in the above proposals. The informal consultations undertaken thus far have all resulted in the desire for new controls / changes to existing controls of one nature or another in several areas. The ongoing consultations could potentially result in the same outcome.
- 3.2 Therefore, it is likely that the present review will take longer than the normal cycle to complete, and based on the feedback received thus far, the earliest one might expect the next review to commence, dealing with issues elsewhere throughout the borough, would be mid to late 2013, with implementation of any subsequently developed controls, around 18 months after that, some time in 2015.
- 3.3 The Committee could decide to reduce the scope of the current town centre CPZ review to shorten its duration, and enable the next review of the outer areas to start sooner, but this is not recommended.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 A number of informal consultations have been undertaken, or are ongoing. The results of the consultation have been / will be analysed, discussed with ward and divisional councillors, and where appropriate, schemes proposed and presented to future meetings of the Committee.
- 4.2 In cases where limited controls are proposed, or controls are restricted to relatively small, well-defined areas, it is recommended that further consultations should be carried out directly with residents by letter. However, if more substantial changes, or ones involving pay and display result, it is recommended that public exhibitions are undertaken, to allow members of the public to discuss the proposals with officers.

5 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Existing resources will be used to conduct the consultations and the only additional expenditure will be postage. Where possible, any public exhibitions will be held at Council facilities.

6 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The creation of disabled parking places outside Buryfields Clinic as part of the extended control hours / pay and display proposals will improve access to this facility for those with mobility issues. These proposals will be progressed regardless of the findings of the informal consultation about extended control hours / pay and display.

7 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

8 HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1 At the time on-street parking enforcement was decriminalised in 2004, there were around 150 kilometres of controls located in around 330 roads across the borough. Since then around 25 kilometres of additional controls have been introduced across the borough, and now, around 175 kilometres of restriction are present in around 390 roads. This has been achieved with no significant changes to enforcement resources. Currently, 'out of hours' enforcement is arranged on a voluntary basis and undertaken when considered necessary.

8.2 Nevertheless, the Borough's existing enforcement of the public car parks in the vicinity of the G-Live development would allow enforcement of the adjacent on-street parking controls associated with the Dene Road area proposals. Furthermore, the possible introduction of limited controls in Onslow Village, St Lukes, and the inclusion of Rivermount Gardens within the CPZ, could readily be accommodated within the existing patrol route structure. It is envisaged that income derived from contraventions and the extended period during which on-street pay and display charges would operate in the Dene Road area, would pay for these patrols.

8.3 However, if more significant controls were to be developed in Onslow Village and / or the ongoing consultations in the Millmead and Woodbridge Road areas resulted in more widespread evening controls, situated away from the town centre car parks, this, combined with the previously highlighted increases in the lengths of restrictions requiring enforcement elsewhere throughout the borough, could have enforcement resource implications.

8.4 Although it is likely that the enforcement of more significant proposals could, like the introduction of more limited controls, be funded through the income derived from contraventions, and possibly additional pay and display income, if there was a desire for the patrol frequencies during the extended hours of control to be similar to those currently undertaken during the existing prioritisation hours, there may be a need to review enforcement resource requirements.

8.5 Ultimately, there may be a need for the overall number of 'enforcement-hours' to be increased. Alternatively, if the same number of 'enforcement-hours' were to be maintained, but covering a larger area and/or over a longer time period, it might be possible for the existing frequency of enforcement patrols during current 'core patrol hours' to be reduced. However, care would have to be taken to ensure that compliance levels did not deteriorate as a result.

8.6 This issue will be discussed in more detail in a future report to the Committee, when the findings of additional consultation in Onslow Village and the ongoing consultations in the Millmead and Woodbridge Road areas are known.

9 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 To consult in the areas highlighted in the report to address parking issues in these areas and depending on the outcome to use the results to develop formal proposals to be advertised.

10 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

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

11 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

11.1 The various consultations will be undertaken and where appropriate the results used to develop proposals in consultation with ward and divisional councillors to be presented to the Committee at a later meeting.

LEAD OFFICER: David Curl, Parking Strategy & Implementation Manager
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 03456 009009

E-MAIL: parking@surreycc.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER: Kevin McKee, Parking Services Manager
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 01483 444530
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

BACKGROUND PAPERS: