

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

**DATE: 11 DECEMBER 2015**

**LEAD OFFICER: JACK ROBERTS (ENGINEER, PARKING STRATEGY & IMPLEMENTATION TEAM)**

**SUBJECT: ON-STREET PARKING IN GREAT AUSTINS, FARNHAM: RESULTS OF CONSULTATION**

**DIVISION: FARNHAM SOUTH**



**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Officers of Surrey County Council's parking team have carried out a consultation with residents of the Great Austins area in Farnham over a potential parking scheme. This scheme covers several streets and aims to manage parking over a large area in order to provide a long term solution to current parking issues in Great Austins. The results of this consultation have been analysed and compiled into this report. A breakdown of the responses from each street, as well as from elsewhere in Farnham, has been provided.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- (i) The proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Farnham South as shown on the drawing in **Annex A** and subsequently amended by paragraphs 4.5 to 4.8 of this report be agreed for advertisement.
- (ii) The local committee allocates funding as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) The intention of the county council to make an order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on-street parking restrictions in Farnham South as shown on the drawing in **Annex A** and subsequently amended by paragraphs 4.5 to 4.8 of this report is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.
- (iv) Any objections will be considered by the Parking Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant local Member, who will decide whether the order should still be made with or without modification.
- (v) If necessary the Parking Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member make minor adjustments to the proposals following the meeting.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as shown in **Annex A** and subsequently amended by paragraphs 4.5 to 4.8 of this report. They will make a positive impact towards:-

- Road safety
- Access for emergency vehicles
- Access for refuse vehicles
- Easing localised traffic congestion
- Better regulated parking
- Better enforcement
- Better compliance

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 Parking in the Great Austins area has been increasing over the past several years, as more parking restrictions have been introduced around the Farnham town centre and railway station area. These new and extended parking schemes have caused parked vehicles to be displaced further outwards from the town. As the Great Austins area is almost entirely unrestricted, it has been a location that commuters, school staff and other members of the public have started to use for long stay parking.
- 1.2 The vast majority of displaced vehicles have moved to Little Austins Road, and to a lesser extent in Mavins Road. In 2013, a parking scheme was proposed for these two streets based on a 'curfew' yellow line, which prevents parking between 11am and 12noon, and in effect, stops all-day parking from taking place. However, when these schemes were advertised the following year, multiple objections were received from several nearby streets, primarily concerned about the displacement that these extensive restrictions would cause. It was therefore decided not to proceed with these restrictions.
- 1.3 In the past year or so, and as a direct result of additional parking restrictions being installed in roads such as Morley Road, York Road and Lancaster Avenue, there has been a significant increase in the number of parked cars being displaced to Little Austins Road and Mavins Road. This has inevitably resulted in a return of the requests for parking restrictions in these two streets (see the petition presented by Mr David Wydenbach at the 20 March 2015 meeting of this committee). However, the displacement-based objections submitted by residents from neighbouring streets were fully understood and perfectly valid, which is why these previous proposals were not progressed. This has led to a difficult decision having to be made for the Great Austins area, as the only way to truly control displacement is to restrict all the streets where vehicles are likely to move to, whilst still allowing opportunities to park in those streets but in designated areas.
- 1.4 This has been the basis for the proposals presented to residents in this consultation. The proposed parking scheme covers not only Little Austins Road and Mavins Road, but also Great Austins, Greenhill Road, Middle Avenue, Swingate Road and part of Vicarage Hill.

## **2. CONSULTATION:**

- 2.1 Letters explaining the history of parking proposals in Great Austins, as well as the current proposals being presented, were sent to residents at the end of October. Residents were asked to view the enclosed A3 sized colour plan (**Annex A**) and complete an online form which was made available on our parking webpage for Waverley ([www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking/waverley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking/waverley)).
- 2.2 An 'Explanation of Restrictions' sheet (**Annex B**) was also enclosed to explain what the restrictions meant and why they were being proposed. The deadline for responses was 20 November 2015.
- 2.3 All residential properties fronting the proposed restrictions were written to, in addition to the following buildings:
- The Ridgeway School, Frensham Road** (some parking bays in the scheme were specifically designed for Ridgeway School staff).
- St Thomas-On-The-Bourne, Frensham Road** (fronts Swingate Road and some parking bays in the scheme were specifically designed for church visitors).
- The Bourne Hall, Vicarage Hill** (fronts proposed restrictions).
- 2.4 Residents were given the option to submit their response in writing, although it was stated in the letter that it would help if the online form was used. This online form asked residents for their name, address and their feedback through a short series of questions.
- 2.5 The first question asked "*do you support the introduction of the proposed parking management scheme shown on the plan?*" If a 'yes' answer was given, then only comments were asked for. However, if a 'no' answer was given, a second question then asked "*would you support the introduction of the scheme if changes were made to it?*" If a 'yes' answer was given to this question, residents were then asked to describe these changes and submit any other comments. However, if a 'no' answer was given, then residents were asked why they were against the scheme and also to submit any other comments.
- 2.6 This online form was intended to capture the views of both 'for' and 'against' parties in a productive way in order to help develop the scheme prior to any potential advertisement.
- 2.7 It is important to note that some residents who answered 'yes' to the first question went on to suggest changes to the scheme when they were later asked to submit comments. Technically, these residents should have answered 'no' to the first question and then submitted their changes when later asked. However, without knowing the full series of questions in the form, this is easily excusable. It should also be borne in mind that some residents may not feel that strongly about the changes they have asked for, and generally want to see the scheme go ahead regardless. Either way, the online form will have captured all residents' suggested changes, which are summarised below regardless of where they were submitted on the online form.

### **3. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 In order to easily understand residents' views and any changes being requested, the breakdown of the responses has been provided below on a 'street by street' basis. Whilst individual members of each household could

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

## ITEM 10

submit their views, for simplicity the total figures provided are based on households only.

### 3.2 **Great Austins**

54 properties were sent letters as part of the consultation. This included 'The Lindens' flats. 15 households responded to the consultation: 13 of which supported the plan as shown and 2 did not support the plan in its entirety.

Comments included:

- Concern over increase in traffic speed should a no parking ban be introduced for the entire street.
- Request for the railway station car park to be expanded and for better car park provision at schools and colleges to allow more parking on site.
- Relief that parking by junctions and entrances is finally being addressed.

Suggested changes included: -

- A single yellow line on the south side of Great Austins to still allow school peak time parking on this side only.

### 3.3 **Little Austins Road**

17 properties were sent letters as part of the consultation. All of which responded to the consultation and all supported the plan as shown.

Comments included:

- Expression of the urgency that this scheme is required and a general relief that something is finally being done. General praise of the scheme.
- Concern that pick up and drop off parking can still be hazardous and obstructive, even without commuter parking.
- Some 'residents only' parking bays would help provide parking for residents in the area.

Suggested changes included: -

- Preventing parking on one side of the road through the introduction of double yellow lines on one side.

### 3.4 **Mavins Road**

12 properties were sent letters as part of the consultation. 10 households responded to the consultation: 9 of which supported the plan as shown and 1 supported the plan subject to changes being made.

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

Comments included:

- General praise of the scheme. Thoughtful, sensible, long overdue, etc.
- Schools should have enough parking on site for staff.

Suggested changes included:

- Preventing parking on one side of the road through the introduction of double yellow lines on one side.
- Removing the unrestricted parking bays or making them 'residents only'.
- Not having parking bays opposite driveways.

### 3.5 Middle Avenue

14 properties were sent letters as part of the consultation. 9 households responded to the consultation: 6 of which supported the plan as shown and 3 supported the plan subject to changes being made.

Comments included:

- Middle Avenue is being given a disproportionate amount of parking bays compared to others streets. Fairer to have one bay rather than two.
- Church parking on-street is not necessary.
- Farnham railway station car park expansion has been agreed and therefore the need to accommodate commuter parking within Great Austins should be reviewed.
- Concern that changing the single yellow line times to match Swingate Road (*see suggested change below*) will mean that late arriving/late working commuters will be able to park in Middle Avenue.

Suggested changes included:

- Removal or relocation of the bays opposite the two driveways to number 1 Middle Avenue to help maintain access. This refers to the two '4 hour' bays in both Middle Avenue and Swingate Road.
- Change the limited waiting period from '4 hours' to '2 hours' on both the Middle Avenue and Swingate Road bays. This will reduce the likelihood of these bays being used by school staff who could move their cars over to the single yellow lines before the 4 hour period is over (restriction intended for church visitors).
- Change the single yellow line times so that they are the same as Swingate Road (10am to 11am) in order to provide further additional space for church visitors during periods of exceptionally large attendance.

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

## ITEM 10

- Unrestricted parking bay at the Mavins Road end of Middle Avenue should be moved closer to the junction (25m from junction is unusually long).
- Residents' parking only. Church parking should not be provided on street.

### 3.6 Greenhill Road

41 properties were sent letters as part of the consultation. 20 households responded to the consultation: 11 of which supported the plan as shown and 9 supported the plan subject to changes being made.

Comments included:

- Request for narrow yellow lines to be used. (*this would be the case being a conservation area*).
- Double yellow lines not necessary.
- Support for double yellow lines on the north side, particularly opposite the proposed parking bays.
- A single yellow line applying 11am to 12noon is all that is needed. There will not be an influx of parked cars if this restriction is in place; therefore there is no need for double yellow lines applying at any time.
- Requirement for some properties with more cars than driveway space to park on street. Permits are therefore required.
- Minimum street furniture should be installed (sign posts and sign plates).

Suggested changes included: -

- The north side of Greenhill Road to be made single yellow (11am to 12noon) and not double yellow lines.
- Double yellow lines on the south side opposite the junctions.
- Replacing the two 25m bays at the western end with one 30m parking bay further from the junction.
- Resident parking permits for properties with limited off-street parking available.
- Total number of parking bays to be reduced from 3 to 2.
- Restrictions to be on eastern end of Greenhill Road only but not along the entire length, which would spoil the rural character of the road.

### 3.7 Swingate Road

15 properties were sent letters as part of the consultation. 8 households responded to the consultation: 7 of which supported the plan as shown and 1 supported the plan subject to changes being made.

Comments included:

- Extremely well thought out and considered plan.
- The proposals will help protect the long term character and amenity of the Great Austins Conservation Area.

Suggested changes included:

- Relocate the 25m parking bay opposite number 7 so that it is not opposite the driveways for this property.

### 3.8 Vicarage Hill (part)

18 properties were sent letters as part of the consultation (those located between the junctions with Frensham Road and Swingate Road only). This included 1 Old Church Lane as it has a driveway by proposed restrictions on Vicarage Hill. This also included The Bourne Hall. 6 households responded to the consultation, including The Bourne Hall: 4 of which supported the plan as shown and 2 (including the Bourne Hall) supported the plan subject to changes being made.

Comments included: -

- Dealing with the whole of the Great Austins Conservation area as one is highly pragmatic and sensible, so each road takes some burden of the parking that takes place.
- The scheme is well thought out and addresses the needs of commuters, school users and church visitors.

Suggested changes included:

- Double yellow lines for 25 metres on the west side of Vicarage Hill where it joins with Frensham Road, to improve visibility and safety at that junction (*request from Swingate Road resident*).
- A reduction of the double yellow lines which will significantly reduce the ability for visitors to The Bourne Hall and their staff to park.
- Additional length of double yellow lines to maintain sight lines for the access at number 6.

### 3.9 The Bourne Hall (Response from Showshack Dance & Theatre School)

The proposed double yellow lines for Vicarage Hill will have a devastating effect on this small community business, which is used by large numbers of local children, who have to be dropped off at a range of times throughout the day and

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

evening. The proposed restrictions will put them at a greater risk. There are also disabled people using the hall who require safe access.

Monday to Friday has many Performing Arts and accredited examination classes equivalent to GCSE and A Levels as follows: -  
The Nursery school have very young toddlers in attendance from 9am – 2pm.  
Baby Ballet classes start at 2pm – 4pm  
Dance and Drama classes 3pm – 9.30pm  
All of these require parents to be able to park close to the Bourne Hall, for relatively short periods of time.

Showshack staff, who often have to carry heavy sound equipment, have to park in the surrounding roads owing to the Ridgeway School parking situation (*many Ridgeway School members of staff park in Vicarage Hill*).

### 3.10 Ridgeway School

The response submitted from the school is provided below. This was sent in along with approximately **125 signatures** in a petition format under the title “*I object to the introduction of parking restrictions as proposed by Surrey County Council’s Great Austins Consultation*”. In addition, **24 individual signatures** were submitted under the same title. These are believed to be from parents and carers with children who attend the school, in addition to school staff.

The School’s Response:

We provide a personalised education for approximately 100 children aged 2-19 years who have severe and profound multiple learning difficulties. Many have an additional medical diagnosis.

To meet the needs of our children with special needs we directly employ 81 members of staff. In addition, we have a health team based on site and contract staff such as catering and cleaning staff.

Currently our car park has 28 staff bays, 3 visitor bays and 1 disabled bay. Set against 81 staff, plus 2 catering staff, 3 medical staff and a further 5 therapy staff you can see that we have staff parking for 28, but 91 potential staff on site on a daily basis. That is already a potential 63 members of staff finding parking in surrounding roads, without considering casual staff or visitors to the school. Most days we experience a high volume of visitors which include parents, agency staff, health practitioners, doctors and other visiting professionals.

We have obtained planning permission and engaged a contractor to create an additional 5 parking bays on the school site. This is not to provide additional parking as a result of an increased number of visitors/vehicles to the school resulting from any additional teaching accommodation or school development. Instead this is to make it easier for those visiting, to access the site and attend the statutory meetings that are held annually for all pupils. The creation of the additional parking has come at a cost of £X to the school.

We have made every effort to provide as much parking for staff and visitors as possible. We have negotiated with The Bourne Club which is situated next door to the school and we have 6 parking spaces for staff in their car park. We



have also negotiated with St Thomas on the Bourne Church and when parents come in to school for assemblies and events they often allow us to use their car park. However, if they have any functions such as weddings or funerals then the parking facility is not available to us.

We have conducted a poll of our staff to ascertain where people park. Of our staff, 28 park on the school site, 6 park in The Bourne Club car park and 33 park in the Vicarage Hill and Swingate Road areas. 5 members of the health team also park on site. We conducted a poll of visitors on 5th November 2015. Of 13 visitors that day, 6 parked on site and 7 parked in the Vicarage Hill and Swingate Road areas. When we run training courses we can have as many as 25 visitors a day, many of whom have to park off site.

Should the parking restrictions be approved we fully expect that the school will not be able to operate for the following reasons:

- 1.) We will be unable to recruit or retain staff if they are unable to park within reasonable walking distance of the school. The school can't operate if staff can't get in.
- 2.) There is no alternative parking as other local roads, such as Edward Road to the west of the school, are already full.
- 3.) There is no public parking within walking distance of the school.
- 4.) The majority of our employees are classroom support staff. They are paid on a low rate and for term time only. They are unable to pay for parking as it would not be financially worth their while to work at the school.

In summary, **we strongly object to the proposals** for the reasons outlined above and we do not believe that the school will be viable should these parking restrictions be imposed.

### 3.11 **St Thomas-On-The-Bourne**

The Reverend Canon responded in support of the plan as shown.

### 3.12 **Reponses from outside of consultation area**

The Great Austins consultation was being carried out around the same time as the Waverley 2015 Parking Review advertisement, with both having the same deadline for responses (20 November 2015). The information for both of these was available via the same webpage ([www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking/waverley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking/waverley)), therefore a resident looking up the Waverley Parking Review could see that there was a consultation being carried out in Great Austins. Technically, there was nothing stopping residents outside of the Great Austins area from completing the online form, although they were required to say where they lived.

It is understood that a large number of parents, carers and members of staff belonging to the South Farnham School and Abbey School on Menin Way completed the online form for the Great Austins consultation. As school pick up

and drop off parking takes place on Great Austins and adjoining streets, these residents would have felt inclined to respond.

It is also understood that a number of parents, carers and members of staff belonging to the Ridgeway School on Frensham Road completed the online form for the Great Austins consultation. These expressed the same views stated in the submitted petition. There were also some responses from commuters using the Farnham Railway Station.

Bearing in mind that any agreed scheme would be advertised and therefore open to any member of the public living in or outside of the Great Austins area, it is useful that these responses have been submitted now, rather than during an advertisement. However, as this high number of additional responses was not anticipated or planned for, only a limited amount of time has been available to go through these and therefore only a 'general feeling' has been established.

There were around 135 responses received from residents outside of the consultation area (residents who were not directly written to and invited to respond). Almost all of the 135 responses were against the scheme, although around half of these suggested changes.

There is no question that the most requested change related to Great Austins. There was a mix of requests to leave this road unrestricted; to make the double yellow lines single yellow (11am to 12noon); or to just make the south side single yellow (11am to 12noon) or left unrestricted.

#### **4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 4.1 171 properties were sent letters as part of the consultation. 85 households responded to the consultation: 67 of which supported the plan as shown, 16 supported the plan subject to changes being made and 2 did not support the plan in its entirety.
- 4.2 In addition, The Ridgeway School (Frensham Road) did not support the plan in its entirety and St Thomas-On-The-Bourne (Frensham Road) supported the plan as shown.
- 4.3 With a 50% response rate, 79% of households supported the plan as shown.
- 4.4 With strong consideration given to both the responses from those directly consulted, and also those from outside of the Great Austins area, the following conclusions and recommended changes are provided below (all recommended changes are shown in bold).
- 4.5 **A single yellow line (11am to 12noon) to be provided on the south side of Great Austins, excluding the vicinity of The Lindens entrance and the junction with Swingate Road, which will remain as double yellow. The existing double yellow lines on the junctions with Little Austins Road and Mavins Road will be extended in both directions by approximately 5 to 10m.** This will prevent all-day parking whilst still allowing pick up and drop off parking to continue.

- 4.6 **The two '4 hour' bays on Swingate Road and Middle Avenue to be changed to '2 hours' (Monday to Friday 2 hours no return within 1 hour).**  
This will help towards prioritising the bays for church visitors, for which they are primarily intended for. The proposed 4 hour bays potentially being used by school staff intending to move their cars over to a curfew single yellow line is a valid concern, in regards to church visitor space being lost as a result of this.
- 4.7 **A single yellow line (11am to 12noon) to be provided on the north side of Greenhill Road, excluding its junctions with Swingate Road, Mavins Road, Little Austins Road and Tilford Road, which will remain as double yellow.**  
This will prevent all-day parking whilst still allowing parking for the majority of the day as and when required.
- 4.8 **An additional length of double yellow lines to be provided outside number 6 Vicarage Hill in order to improve and maintain sight lines for the driveway at this property. Exact length and location subject to site inspection.**
- 4.9 Having double yellow lines on one side of Little Austins Road and Mavins Road is not the majority view and is therefore not being recommended.
- 4.10 When deciding where to locate parking bays, both in this scheme and elsewhere, care is always taken to ensure that the bays are not in a hazardous or obstructive part of the road (e.g. too near to a bend or junction, or on a road which is too narrow for parking). In addition, parking bays are not placed too close to any driveways that are on the same side of the road as the bay, in order to give better sight lines and access for such drives. However, achieving all of this in addition to not having a bay located opposite a driveway is very difficult, particularly as most driveways are in a staggered formation. Whilst parking opposite a driveway would make access more difficult, on 6 to 7m wide roads, it is unlikely that access would be prevented completely. The current situation is that most of the bays in this scheme have driveways opposite them, and without breaking all of these bays up into multiple individual bays, clearing driveways on both sides of the street in the same location is not going to be possible.
- 4.11 Parking for Ridgeway School staff has been considered from the start of this scheme for Great Austins. The three parking bays on the southern end of Swingate Road and the western end of Greenhill Road have an applied new restriction specifically intended for Ridgeway School staff. These bays will hold 15 cars in total. In addition, the western side of Vicarage Hill in the vicinity of the junction with Frensham Road has been left unrestricted, as it is known that Ridgeway School staff use this part of Vicarage Hill to park. 15 cars can park here in total.
- 4.12 The total staff numbers for the Ridgeway School as stated in their response is surprisingly high. The response stated that there are 91 potential staff on site on a daily basis with a potential 63 members of staff finding parking in surrounding roads. This would be in addition to visitors to the school.
- 4.13 The number of cars currently parking in the western end of Great Austins does not reflect anywhere near this level of school parking, therefore it has to be said that these members of staff and visitors cannot all be attending the school at the same time. This is why the number of 'school staff bays' drawn in the scheme, in addition to the unrestricted spaces in Vicarage Hill and also the

## ITEM 10

school's own car park, was deemed to be sufficient. In addition, all of the single yellow line restrictions used in this scheme support school pick up and drop off parking, as well as visitor parking outside of the 1 hour curfew times. However, it is asked that the committee note the serious concerns and objections that the Ridgeway School have provided, although no amendments to the scheme are being proposed as a result of this response.

- 4.14 Finally, regarding the Bourne Hall and the Showshack Dance & Theatre School, it was known that the proposed double yellow lines in Vicarage Hill would reduce the total number of 'parking spaces' currently being used and that the Bourne Hall would likely express concerns about this.
- 4.15 Whilst the total length of double yellow lines proposed for Vicarage Hill does look extensive and somewhat excessive on the plan, the majority of these double yellow lines are precautionary, in terms of preventing displacement to the inside of the bend along Vicarage Hill. This is because the majority of this bend is not parked on at the moment, but several cars do park opposite the Bourne Hall, even though it is taking place on the inside of the bend and obstructing sight lines.
- 4.16 It should be noted that pick ups and drop offs can take place on double yellow lines, although this is referring to a quick stop rather than a short parking period. It should also be noted that blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours if they display their permit clock showing their arrival time.
- 4.17 Whilst there is potential for a gap in the double yellow lines to be created opposite the Bourne Hall, it is recommended that the restrictions in Vicarage Hill be advertised in their entirety and for such a change to be considered after the advertisement stage.
- 4.18 As part of the advertisement stage, meetings can be held with the Ridgeway School and the Showshack Dance & Theatre School in order to discuss their concerns and objections further.

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

- 5.1 The total cost of advertising and implementing these restrictions in isolation (separate from an annual Waverley parking review) is estimated to be £10,000. This would require an agreement to allocate funding for the 2016/17 financial year, when such advertisements and installations would take place.

### **6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 6.1 There are no specific equalities and diversity implications for this report.

### **7. LOCALISM:**

- 7.1 Each location where parking restrictions are proposed to be amended will have an impact on the local residents and visitors in that area. This effect will vary from slight to significant depending on the resident's/businesses circumstances and requirements for parking on street. The advertisement stage will allow

these effected parties to get involved and comment or object to the proposals. This will impact on what decisions are made following the advertisement. Local councillors can also help in this process by liaising with residents who may not want to contact the parking team directly, and prefer to deal with their local councillor instead.

## **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

### 8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

There should be fewer instances of obstructive parking as a consequence of the restrictions.

## **9. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 9.1 Subject to agreement and funding being provided for the 2016/17 financial year, the advertisement and installations would take place between April and July 2016 (inclusive).

### **Contact Officer:**

Jack Roberts (Engineer – Parking Team)

### **Consulted:**

- All residential properties fronting the proposed restrictions.
- The Ridgeway School, Frensham Road (some parking bays in the scheme were specifically designed for Ridgeway School staff).
- St Thomas-On-The-Bourne, Frensham Road (fronts Swingate Road and some parking bays in the scheme were specifically designed for church visitors).
- The Bourne Hall, Vicarage Hill (fronts proposed restrictions).

### **Annexes:**

Annex A – Proposal Plan

## ITEM 10

Annex B – Explanation of Restrictions

**Sources/background papers:**

Waverley Parking Review – 26 June 2015 (Committee Report)

---