

## SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

## LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

**DATE:** WEDNESDAY 11 DECEMBER 2013

**LEAD OFFICER:** DAVID CURL, PARKING STRATEGY & IMPLEMENTATION TEAM MANAGER

**SUBJECT:** GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW – SCOPING REPORT FOR NON-CPZ REVIEW

**DIVISION:** ALL OUTSIDE THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The report presents the parking issues that have been raised about locations outside the Guildford town controlled parking zone (the non-CPZ area). This report recommends the scope of the review and recommends the next steps.

It also details the formal representations received resulting from the recent advertisement of proposals near the railway level crossing in Sample Oak Lane and Dorking Road, Chilworth are reported and the next steps recommended.

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

- (i) Informal public consultation of parking controls in and around the following areas will be undertaken and the outcomes considered by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and local ward and divisional councillors with any proposals arising presented back to the Local Committee for authority to formally advertise,
- a. Burpham and Merrow shopping parades
  - b. Avondale Estate, Ash Vale
  - c. Effingham Junction
  - d. Fairlands Estate
  - e. Shalford
- (ii) That, subject to the approval of the proposed Woodbridge Hill improvement scheme, any resulting parking restrictions will be included in the scope of this review.

(ii) That in respect of the Ad Hoc requests referred to in paragraph 2.24 and 2.26 a preliminary desktop assessment is undertaken, and the findings reported to a future meeting of the Local Committee **or** delegated for consideration to the Transportation Task Group,

(iv) To receive a report at a future meeting of the Committee seeking authority to formally advertise the changes necessary to accommodate formalised Disabled Bays and Vehicle Crossovers (CPZ or non CPZ),

(v) That the proposals for the traffic regulation order for Chilworth is made with changes to parking restrictions as set out in **Annexe 1** and that the controls implemented are funded from the Guildford on-street parking account.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To assist with safety, access, traffic movements, increase the availability of space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities, and to and make local improvements.

## **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 elsewhere within the borough (non-CPZ). It was envisaged that each cycle would take 18 months.
- 1.2 The last review concerning non-CPZ issues was completed in August 2012. The most recent review, dealing with issues within the CPZ, is nearing completion, and changes are either in the process of being advertised or implemented.
- 1.3 During the last review outside the CPZ, the major assessment of various issues were undertaken in Ashenden, Park Barn, Slyfield, Stoughton and Westborough areas.
- 1.4 Additionally, an assessment criteria was agreed for the consideration of issues concerning one or two roads, or specific locations within particular roads, and a preliminary assessment was undertaken of over 100 locations. Around 30 locations were progressed to a full assessment, and of these, controls were subsequently implemented in around 20 locations.
- 1.5 Although the intention is for the reviews to take around 18 months to complete, the last reviews of the CPZ and outside CPZ areas have each taken around two and a half years to complete. Therefore, one whole review cycle, has taken almost 5 years to complete, as opposed to the 3 years envisaged. Understandably everyone is concerned about how long the process takes.
- 1.6 The reason for the long reviews is a tendency to include as many items as possible in a review, so they do not have to wait for the next review. In addition, we currently report the results to each cycle of informal consultation to the Committee and get agreement before moving to the next step. When the process was first introduced the Committee met every six weeks but it now meets every three months.
- 1.7 The process has recently been considered by the Transportation Task Group. The Task Group agreed that to have faster reviews the scope of each review should be more restricted. This would mean that those areas the Committee considered a higher priority could be implemented faster, but would also mean that those items not included a particular review would have to wait longer.
- 1.8 The Task Group also agreed that the process could be streamlined if more decisions were delegated to officers consulting the local members and the Chairman. The two key decisions are what is included in a review and what proposals are put forward as a solution to a particular issue. It was recommended that these decisions are made by the Committee and work on the design, consideration of initial consultations, and the consideration of objections once a proposal has been agreed by the Committee, is delegated to officers in consultation with local members and the Chairman.
- 1.9 The scope of the review and the recommendations in this report are made to reflect these changes.

- 1.10 The Committee agreed in September to formally advertise proposals in Sample Oak Lane and Dorking Road, Chilworth, in the vicinity of the railway level crossing. The concerns about parking in the vicinity of the level crossing were such that it was felt appropriate to consider the issue at the earliest opportunity. Indeed, it had already prompted Surrey County Council Highways, with the support of Surrey Police, to introduce temporary physical barriers, as a stop-gap, to prevent parking. The proposals shown in Annexe 1 were formally advertised between 1 and 22 November 2013. The representations received as a result of the formal advertisement appear in Annexe 2.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

- 2.1 A list of areas where concerns about parking restrictions have been raised appears below with the concerns highlighted:

### **Geographic areas**

- Burpham and Merrow shopping parades – concerns raised about turnover, the use of space and inconsiderate parking,
- Avondale estate and surrounding roads, Ash Vale – concerns raised about parking by rail commuters, the employees and visitors to the industrial estate and inconsiderate parking,
- Old Lane, Effingham Common Road and surrounding roads in Effingham Junction - concerns raised about parking by rail commuters, inconsiderate parking and pressure created by residents parking,
- Fairlands Estate – concerns raised about the turnover of space around the shopping parade, parking associated with the school run, and inconsiderate parking,
- Shalford – concerns about the turnover of space around the shopping parade, inconsiderate parking and pressure on parking created by residents,
- Woodbridge Hill, Stoughton– changes to the existing parking restrictions and the creation of new parking restrictions maybe needed to support an environmental improvement scheme which is currently being designed,
- Ashenden, Park Barn, Slyfield, Stoughton and Westborough areas – concerns raised about non-resident parking,
- School expansion programme and potential issues associated with school run.

### **Others**

In addition, there are a number of isolated requests for new restrictions:

- Ad Hoc requests for controls in other locations. We have a list of in excess of 100 issues, which we will assess under the agreed scoring system and report separately to the Committee, unless the Committee would prefer these were delegated to the Transportation Task Group,
- Formalisation of disabled spaces for specific residents and at particular locations and accommodation of new and extended vehicle crossovers adjacent to formalised parking bays.

- 2.2 It is hard to estimate in advance how long an item will take to review, as it depends on the nature of the solution and the public reaction to it. The level of work is not known until the work has begun. However, all of the items shown above could be included in a review, although the number of Ad Hoc items included would be less than in the previous review of the non-CPZ areas.
- 2.3 During the previous review of the non-CPZ areas 30 locations were considered and 20 resulted in restrictions being implemented. These were selected by a scoring system agreed by the Committee and included areas which had an accident history. There remains a list of over 100 locations where restrictions have been requested but the last review addressed the ones with greatest need and we will therefore restrict the number of issues considered in this review by selecting fewer from this list to progress.

### **Burpham and Merrow shopping parades**

- 2.4 In 2011 the County Council considered concerns about a lack of churn at a number of shopping areas in the County and proposed introducing pay and display. The Local Committee did not support the proposals for pay and display at the locations listed but agreed to review the need for restrictions itself. The majority of the locations were covered during the controlled parking zone review, but as Kingspost and Merrow Parades fell outside the town centre controlled parking zone, it suggested that these be reviewed during the next review of outer areas.
- 2.5 In both locations, concerns have also been raised about inconsiderate parking in nearby roads, namely Burpham Lane and Merrow Street. Although these locations were considered as part of the last non-CPZ review, they did not score highly enough to be progressed. However, if controls were to be introduced within Kingpost and Merrow Parades, and the surrounding areas remained uncontrolled, the issues in Burpham Lane, Merrow Street and other nearby roads could be exacerbated.
- 2.6 We recommended informal consultation is conducted about the possibility of new and amended parking controls in and around Burpham and Merrow shopping parades, and that the feedback is considered by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager, in consultation with the local ward and divisional councillors, and any solutions developed are report to the Committee to seek authority to formally advertise them.

### **Avondale Estate and surrounding roads**

- 2.7 There are long-standing issues associated with parking around Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations. During the 2006/8 non-CPZ parking review, this area, along with Ripley, formed one of the two Geographic areas considered as part of that review. For a number of years, the controls that were subsequently introduced have proven effective, and relatively little correspondence has been received.
- 2.8 However, during the course of the last CPZ review, an amount of correspondence has been received, particularly about Station Roads East and West. The impact that parking on the north side of the road has on

visibility and the ability for two vehicles to pass along the road has been highlighted. Additionally, the parking situation in Station Road West, much of which is unadopted and owned by Guildford Borough Council, has been raised. Indeed, badly worn double yellow lines, which are not supported by traffic regulation order, and are therefore unenforceable, are already present within certain sections of the private part of the road.

2.9 Concerns have also been raised about parking in Lysons Avenue and Frimley Road. However, it may be worth noting that in the case of the former, the development and opening of a Tesco Metro store appears to have had little impact on the on-street parking situation. Instead, the parking appears to be associated with the nearby industrial units.

2.10 We therefore recommend informal consultation is conducted about the possibility of new and amended parking controls in and around the Avondale Estate, Ash Vale, and that the feedback is considered by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager, in consultation with the local ward and divisional councillors, and any solutions developed are report to the Committee to seek authority to formally advertise them.

### **Effingham Junction**

2.11 During the course of the last CPZ review, those living in Effingham Junction raised concerns about various issues. Overspill parking from a recent residential development, and the issues it causes in Old Lane and the nearby service road has been raised. It is also suggested that inconsiderate parking by rail commuters has becoming more prevalent, both within Old Lane, the nearby service road and beyond the existing controls in Effingham Common Road, south of the railway station, since the increase in parking charges at the railway station car park.

2.12 We therefore recommend informal consultation is conducted about the possibility of new and amended parking controls in Effingham Junction, and that the feedback is considered by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager, in consultation with the local ward and divisional councillors, and any solutions developed are report to the Committee to seek authority to formally advertise them.

### **Fairlands Estate**

2.13 During the course of the last non-CPZ review, the Parish Council raised various concerns about the parking situation in the Fairlands Estate. They were primarily concerned about the lack of turnover of space, the accessibility issues caused to those with mobility issues, and inconsiderate parking in and around the shopping parade. Subsequently, those living elsewhere within the estate have raised concerns about parking around the school and associated with the school run. Of course, if we were to address these issues, and other junctions and bends within the estate left uncontrolled, issues could develop elsewhere.

2.14 We therefore recommend informal consultation is conducted about the possibility of new parking controls in the Fairlands Estate, and that the

feedback is considered by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager, in consultation with the local ward and divisional councillors, and any solutions developed are report to the Committee to seek authority to formally advertise them.

### **Shalford**

- 2.15 As part of the last non-CPZ review, double yellow line junction protection measures were implemented around various of the junctions within Kings Road. However, concerns have subsequently been raised about the ability for vehicles to pass in Chinthurst Lane, in the straight section of the road, adjacent to the common. During the course of the last CPZ review, those living in the cul-de-sacs off Station Road have raised concerns about parking primarily by residents, close to their junctions. The Borough Council's refuse and recycling teams have confirmed that their crews have difficulties servicing the properties in these roads. The County Council have also recently introduced a pedestrian crossing facility in Kings Road. In doing so, they have removed a number of parking spaces immediately outside the shops. The Parish Council has requested that limited waiting parking controls be introduced in the vicinity to compensate.
- 2.16 We recommend informal consultation about the possibility of new and amended parking controls is conducted in Shalford, and that the feedback is considered by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager, in consultation with the local ward and divisional councillors, and the way forward determined, and that if and when any proposals are subsequently developed, a report is presented to the Committee seeking authority to formally advertise them.

### **Woodbridge Hill**

- 2.17 During the course of the last CPZ review, a project began to consider an environmental improvement scheme in Woodbridge Hill. There is an intention to present a report to the March 2014 meeting of this Committee. As a part of these plans it is likely to be necessary to change the parking arrangements and the traffic order that supports them. It is recommended that any changes are considered as part of this review.

### **Westborough**

- 2.18 There has been relatively little correspondence received following the implementation of the parking controls in Park Barn, Slyfield, Stoughton and Westborough in August 2011. The same is true regarding the changes introduced in various other locations in August 2012. Nevertheless, some issues have arisen in a number of the localities, most notably in and around the Southway area.
- 2.19 Concerns have been raised about inconsiderate parking in Beech Grove, Greville Close and within the service road that runs parallel to the main carriageway in Southway. It is suggested that these issues are primarily caused by non-residents, and as a result, there have been some calls for residents' parking to be considered.

## ITEM 9

- 2.20 There is a Westborough Parking Task Group. Recently, the Borough Council's Executive met to agree an action plan for the Task Group, which includes asking the residents' association within Ashenden, Park Barn and Westborough areas, to gauge opinion amongst their members. They have been asked whether they would like further changes to the controls in their areas and whether residents would support a residents parking scheme. There are pockets where parking does cause particular problems but a residents scheme in these areas would push this parking into other areas. The problem likely to be moved unless a permit scheme covering a substantial area was introduced. The feedback we have received suggests that there is not support from residents for a widespread permit scheme in the area.
- 2.21 Guildford Borough Council's Executive agreed to appoint a consultant to look at the problems in the area and to recommend interventions that would improve the situation. It is recommended that parking controls in the area are reassessed in a review when the outcome of the consultant's report is known.
- 2.22 We recommend minor issues are considered on an individual basis and the issues will be picked up when the Ad Hoc changes are considered.

### **School Expansion Programme**

- 2.23 To meet rising demand for primary, junior and infants school places, the County Council has recently embarked upon a programme of expanding existing schools. It is best to consider the need for controls around schools on a individual basis and this issue will be picked up when the Ad Hoc changes are considered.

### **Other requests for controls**

- 2.24 Since 2004, we have received requests for new controls and changes to existing ones in over 100 locations. As part of the last non-CPZ review, we developed an assessment criterion to consider individual requests for controls. This was agreed by the Committee at its meeting in September 2009. Ultimately, controls were introduced in around 20 locations. This followed a preliminary, desktop assessment, a full investigation and the development of proposals, prior to their formal advertisement, consideration of the representations, implementation and making of the order.
- 2.25 Since the last non-CPZ review, numerous additional requests have been received, to add to the locations that were not progressed as part of that review. Again, well in excess of 100 locations are involved.
- 2.26 We recommend that a preliminary desktop assessment is undertaken, and that its findings are reported to the Committee to determine the way forward.

### **Disabled Bays and Vehicle Crossovers**

- 2.27 The County Council considers applications from blue badge holding motorists for disabled spaces in residential areas close to their homes.

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford).



Similarly, the County Council considers applications for vehicle crossovers. Where there is a need for a disabled parking bay to be formalised, or other changes made to the existing formalised parking controls to accommodate a disabled bay or vehicle crossover, Parking Services becomes involved. We progress the necessary changes at the earliest opportunity, within the most convenient parking review. This is done regardless of the geographic location involved (CPZ or non-CPZ).

### **Representations received about Chilworth proposals**

- 2.28 Three representations have been received. Surrey Police, one of the statutory consultees notified, fully support the proposals. A second representation, received from a resident living on the north side of Dorking Road, close to the junction with Sample Oak Lane, suggests that the proposals are not extensive enough, that they will not address the existing issues present on the north side of Dorking Road. The third objects specifically to the proposals on the eastern side of Sample Oak Lane, immediately outside the railway station, on the basis of the loss of facility. Although also suggesting that there is no major issue to resolve, nevertheless, they support the proposals elsewhere.
- 2.29 The proposals for Chilworth were developed on the basis of unsolicited correspondence received about an issue that Surrey County Council – Highways, have taken the unusual step on introducing physical measures, as a stop-gap, to prevent parking. Previously, we had received no correspondence about issues on the north side of Dorking Road, opposite the junction.
- 2.30 The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line controls proposed should assist in resolving the issues in the immediate vicinity of the level crossing, and will improve visibility at the junction for those wishing to turn onto Dorking Road. By proposing controls only on the bellmouth (south) side of Dorking Road, rather than on the opposite side, this will also help to minimise the possibility of parking displacing elsewhere within the road. By introducing controls on the eastern side of Sample Oak Lane, immediately outside the railway station, this will prevent this area being used for long-stay parking. The area will, however, still be available for those loading and unloading, boarding and alighting and undertaking work on the adjacent public highway and railway installations.
- 2.31 It may be possible to consider more extensive controls in the vicinity of those proposed, as part of the assessment of Other Locations, to be considered as part of this review.
- 2.32 Therefore, we recommend that the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to parking restrictions set out in Annexe 1, so that the controls can be implemented, and the implementation be funded from the Guildford on-street parking account.

<b>3. OPTIONS:</b>
--------------------

- 3.1 Consideration of changes necessary to accommodate disabled bays and vehicle crossovers are a constant, and their number can vary from one review to the next. In due course, we will seek authority from the Committee to formally advertise the necessary changes. This will be done as late as possible within the review process, to accommodate as many requests received during the course of the review. Therefore, we recommend that a report to acquire authority to formally advertise the changes is presented to a future meeting of the Committee.
- 3.2 During previous non-CPZ reviews greater emphasis has been placed on the Geographic areas of the review, considering a number of long-standing issues in specific locations. This has meant that we have only been able to address a relatively small number of the 100-or-so Ad Hoc locations where concerns have also been raised.
- 3.3 There is a tendency for the amount of consultation involved in the Geographic area to be more involved than the consideration of issues in Ad Hoc locations. This is particularly true when consideration is given to the prioritisation of parking for particular-user groups (e.g. short-stay), and even more so, when considering the possible introduction of a permit scheme. This can result in one or more informal stages of consultation, prior to the formal process. This, combined with the number of issues being dealt with, can prolong the duration of the reviews significantly.
- 3.4 Therefore, in order for the review to progress in a timely fashion, it is necessary to limit the number of Geographic areas being reviewed. A result, it is recommended that the six Geographic areas listed are progressed. Even so, the consideration of this number of Geographic areas is likely to limit the number of issues in Ad hoc locations that can be progressed. The changes associated with Disabled Bay and Vehicle Crossovers will also be progressed. It is also recommended that within the areas covered by the Geographic areas that emphasis is placed on the safety, access, and the turnover of space (in the case of the shopping parades), rather than the consideration of permit schemes.
- 3.5 Nevertheless, it will still be possible to consider those issues which are not progressed as part of the Geographic areas as Ad hoc issues, so that they are assessed on their own merits and prioritised accordingly, alongside the other issues which have been raised.
- 3.6 Therefore, the list recommended for progression appears below:

**Geographic areas**

- Burpham and Merrow shopping parades – concerns raised about turnover, the use of space and inconsiderate parking,
- Avondale estate and surrounding roads, Ash Vale – concerns raised about parking by rail commuters, the employees and visitors to the industrial estate and inconsiderate parking,
- Old Lane, Effingham Common Road and surrounding roads in Effingham Junction - concerns raised about parking by rail commuters, inconsiderate parking and pressure created by residents parking,

- Fairlands Estate – concerns raised about the turnover of space around the shopping parade, parking associated with the school run, and inconsiderate parking,
- Shalford – concerns about the turnover of space around the shopping parade, inconsiderate parking and pressure on parking created by residents,
- Woodbridge Hill, Stoughton– changes to the existing parking restrictions and the creation of new parking restrictions maybe needed to support an environmental improvement scheme,

#### **Others**

- Ad Hoc requests for controls in other locations. We have a list of in excess of 100 issues, which we will assess under the agreed scoring system and report separately to the Committee, unless the Committee would prefer these were delegated to the Transportation Task Group,
- Formalisation of disabled spaces for specific residents and at particular locations and accommodation of new and extended vehicle crossovers adjacent to formalised parking bays.

3.7 In respect to the proposals in Chilworth, the Committee must consider the representations received. It needs to decide whether to implement the proposals as originally advertised, or implement the proposals with minor changes, which make them less restrictive, or to drop some or all of the proposals. We have formally advertised the proposals and only minor amendments can be made at this stage. If the committee wish to make significant changes, or ones that increase the level of restriction, the relevant proposals would need to be re-advertised to give road-users an opportunity to comment.

#### **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 Although Parish Councils often contact Parking Services to make us aware of parking issues, nevertheless, all Parish Councils within the Borough have been contacted and asked to highlight any parking issues that have been brought to their attention.
- 4.2 In respect to the Westborough Parking Task Group, various residents associations in Ashenden, Park Barn and Westborough have been asked about the possibility of further changes to the parking controls in their areas, including the possibility of residents' parking.
- 4.3 In respect to Chilworth, the proposals have been formally advertised in the Surrey Advertiser and by using street notices at the particular location.

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

- 5.1 To create the order and implement the signs and lines required to give affect to the proposals we estimate will cost no more than £50,000. If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals, the money will come from the Guildford on-street parking account.

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford).

**6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

6.1 Blue badge holders can park in disabled parking bays without time limit or on yellow lines for up to three hours and are exempt from charges for parking on-street. They can also park for an unlimited period in residents only, shared-use or limited waiting parking places.

**7. LOCALISM:**

7.1 At this point of the review it is possible that any proposals subsequently developed could affect all wards, divisions and parishes outside the CPZ, and particularly road users and residents in those areas. All the proposals will be publicised, and the comments drawn from residents and local communities will be carefully considered.

**8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Sustainability implications

8.1 Parking sits alongside Climate Change and Air Quality within the strategies that feed into the Surrey Transport Plan. Therefore, in many respects, these strategies and sustainability are inter-dependant.

8.2 Preventing parking in locations where it would otherwise cause safety and access issues, and in particular, impede traffic, helps reduce congestion, the resultant journey times and pollution. This can be particularly important on bus routes where large, public service vehicles utilise relatively narrow roads.

**9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

9.1 It is recommended that the Committee agrees that:

(i) Informal public consultation of parking controls in and around the following areas will be undertaken and the outcomes considered by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and local ward and divisional councillors with any proposals arising presented back to the Local Committee for authority to formally advertise,

- a. Burpham and Merrow shopping parades
- b. Avondale Estate, Ash Vale
- c. Effingham Junction
- d. Fairlands Estate
- e. Shalford

(ii) That, subject to the approval of the proposed Woodbridge Hill improvement scheme, any resulting parking restrictions will be included in the scope of this review.

(iii) That in respect of the Ad Hoc requests referred to in paragraph 2.24 and 2.26 a preliminary desktop assessment is undertaken, and the findings reported to a future meeting of the Local Committee or delegated for consideration to the Transportation Task Group,

(iv) To receive a report at a future meeting of the Committee seeking authority to formally advertise the changes necessary to accommodate formalised Disabled Bays and Vehicle Crossovers (CPZ or non CPZ),

(v) That the proposals for the traffic regulation order for Chilworth is made with changes to parking restrictions as set out in **Annexe 1** and that the controls implemented are funded from the Guildford on-street parking account.

## **10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

10.1 Residents, businesses and residents' associations in and around Burpham and Merrow shopping parades, the Avondale Estate, Effingham Junction, the Fairlands Estate and Shalford are written to, to establish their views about the parking situation in the various localities, and what, if anything, they would like to see done. The feedback will be reported to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager, and a way forward determined.

10.2 The 100-or-so Ad Hoc requests for parking controls are subject to a preliminary, desktop assessment, and that its findings are reported to the Committee to determine the way forward, unless the Committee would prefer these were delegated to the Transportation Task Group,

---

### **Contact Officer:**

Kevin McKee, Parking Services Manager, Guildford Borough Council  
(01483 444530)

### **Lead Officer:**

David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager, Surrey County Council  
03456 009009

### **Consulted:**

Local Committee (Guildford) Transportation Task Group on the process  
All Parish Councils within the borough  
Various residents' associations in the Ashenden, Park Barn and Westborough areas

### **Annexes:**

1 – Recently advertised proposals for Chilworth,  
2 – Representations received resulting from the advertisement of the above.

## ITEM 9

### **Sources/background papers:**

- Item 12, Local Committee (Guildford), 6 June 2002
  - Item 8, Local Committee (Guildford), 6 May 2004
  - Item 10, Local Committee (Guildford), 30 September 2009
  - Item 17, Local Committee (Guildford), 22 June 2011
  - Item 6, Local Committee (Guildford), 22 September 2011
-