

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD).



SURREY

DATE: WEDNESDAY 23 MARCH 2016

LEAD OFFICER: KEVIN MCKEE, PARKING SERVICES MANAGER, GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

SUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW – PROPOSALS FOR GEOGRAPHIC AREAS AND ‘AD-HOC’ LOCATIONS

DIVISION(S): ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report presents the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals in a number of other geographic areas and ‘ad-hoc’ locations and recommends that traffic regulation orders are made.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree:

- (i) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, shown in ANNEXE 3,
- (ii) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Effingham Junction, shown in ANNEXE 5,
- (iii) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls, covering Fairlands, shown in ANNEXE 7a,
- (iv) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the Merrow shopping parade area, shown in ANNEXE 9,
- (v) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Shalford, shown in ANNEXE 11,
- (vi) that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the ‘ad-hoc’ locations, shown in ANNEXE 13.

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 make local improvements.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 When the scope of the present parking review was determined, the Committee agreed to undertake informal consultations in six geographic areas. These are the Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford.
- 1.2 As part of the current review, it was also agreed to develop proposals in a number of 'ad-hoc' locations. Of the 250 locations we have assessed we have progressed around 20. Furthermore, the review includes changes to accommodate disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and access arrangements for new developments.
- 1.3 Previously, the Committee agreed to formally advertise proposals in the Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford. It also agreed to formally advertise the 20 or so 'ad-hoc' changes, and those associated with disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and access arrangements for new developments. In total, this involved 90 different roads.
- 1.4 The Committee has also agreed that further informal discussions take place with the local ward and divisional councillors, and other interested parties, in respect to possible proposals for Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham) and Ockham Road North (East Horsley), and that these are reported to a future meeting of the Committee, to seek authority to formally advertise them.
- 1.5 This report summarises the feedback received as a result of the formal consultations in the Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford and recommends the next steps. It also presents feedback from a number of the 'ad-hoc' locations that were not considered at the December meeting.
- 1.6 The formal advertisement of proposals associated with the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane and the small number of other locations the Committee agreed to advertise at its December 2015 meeting is ongoing / will be occurring in the next few weeks. Any representations received will be reported to the June 2016 meeting of the Committee.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The formal advertisement of proposals took place between 30 October and 20 November 2015. The proposals involved 90 roads. These encompassed five of the six geographic areas (the Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford), 20 or so 'ad-hoc' locations, and a number of others where changes were necessary to accommodate disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and new developments.

- 2.2 We wrote directly to over 4,700 addresses. A public notice was also published in the Surrey Advertiser newspaper and on the public-notices.co.uk website. Additionally, over 500 street notices were erected in and around the proposed locations. The legal notices and supporting documentation were made available to view at all four deposit centres within the borough. The letter and street notices provided links to the Borough and County Councils' websites. This gave those that were unable to visit the deposit centres an opportunity to view the proposals, supporting documentation and submit comments online.
- 2.3 The page on Guildford Borough Council's website received nearly 5,800 'hits'. Overall, 398 representations were received. Almost 85% of the representations were submitted online. The vast majority of the proposals received representations. Some of the representations referred to proposals in more than one road. In total 467 location-specific references to proposals were made. A table summarising the representations appears in ANNEXE 1.
- 2.4 This report is considering 370 representations associated with five of the geographic areas, and 31 'ad-hoc' locations.

Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations

- 2.5 We wrote directly to around 1,400 addresses in 27 roads, as well as Ash Parish Council. 6 of the roads consulted are private.
- 2.6 Overall, we received 83 representations. There were 32 general comments as well as 60 that referred to specific roads. 13 of the representations stated support for the proposals, 18 general support, 26 general opposition and 35 stated opposition.
- 2.7 Please note the 15 of the 26 that have been classified as being generally opposed to the proposals related to Newfield Road, where those responding generally wanted additional measures to be introduced within their road.
- 2.8 Those making representations raised a number of issues. Across the area, some want more controls, whilst others want fewer measures. The possibility of residents' parking was again raised by some. However, the original informal consultation did not suggest a significant level of support for such a scheme.
- 2.9 The desire for additional facilities to be provided at the railway stations was also referred to. Whilst the creation of additional parking facilities might be advantageous, it is likely that these would be charged for to pay for their development, upkeep and manage use. Those rail users wishing to avoid this additional expense would still look for free alternatives elsewhere.
- 2.10 Within the Avondale estate, concerns were raised about the impact the introduction of controls within the mainly industrial, Station Road West, might have on the nearby residential roads. Concerns were also raised about the impact that the proposed measures at the western end of Station Road East would have on the ability of residents to park at times when the business parking and rail commuters were less of an issue.
- 2.11 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. The revised proposals that have resulted from these discussions and are recommended for implementation appear in ANNEXE 3.

ITEM 10

2.12 In summary, the revisions from the proposals originally advertised are:

- Station Road West / East – make various changes to the south of the road narrowing which delineates the boundary between the industrial and residential areas, to reduce the level of restriction, particularly outside ‘office hours’.

Effingham Junction area

2.13 We wrote directly to around 250 addresses in 8 roads, as well as East Horsley and Effingham Parish Councils and the Effingham Residents and Ratepayers Association. 3 of the roads consulted are private.

2.14 Overall, we received 22 representations. There were 2 general comments as well as 24 that referred to specific roads. 8 of the representations stated support for the proposals, 3 general support, 6 general opposition and 9 stated opposition.

2.15 Those making representations raised a number of issues. Some believed the introduction of additional controls within the main section of Old Lane would result in a loss of facility for those reliant on on-street parking and may increase vehicle speeds. The proposed controls will still allow parking in significant lengths between 11am and 7am the next day. These controls are similar to those employed in Forest Road for many years.

2.16 In respect to the Old Lane service road, concerns were raised about the extents of the double yellow lines and the loss of parking space for residents and others. The possibility of residents’ parking was again raised by some. However, the original informal consultation did not suggest a significant level of support for such a scheme.

2.17 The proposals in Effingham Common Road were broadly welcomed, although some thought their extents should be increased significantly to deter rail commuters parking on-street.

2.18 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. The revised proposals that have resulted from these discussions and are recommended for implementation appear in ANNEXE 5.

2.19 In summary, the revisions from the proposals originally advertised are:

- Old Lane service road- curtail the extent of the restrictions at its junction with the main carriageway, to try to maintain as much parking space as possible.

Fairlands estate

2.20 We wrote directly to around 600 addresses in 15 roads, as well as Worplesdon Parish Council and the Fairlands, Liddington Hall, Gravetts Lane Community Association.

2.21 Overall, we received 37 representations. There were 28 general comments as well as 31 that referred to specific roads. 12 of the representations stated support for the proposals, 15 general support, 2 general opposition and 30 stated opposition.

- 2.22 As with the original, informal consultation many questioned the need for any controls within the estate. However, it was evident that some still wanted the issues associated with the school / school run and the parking associated with the shopping parade to be resolved.
- 2.23 Nevertheless, there was a general feeling that there may be scope to dispense with the proposed controls further away from these 'hotspots'. The introduction of controls in these locations is less likely to have a material effect on parking activity.
- 2.24 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Officers believe that it would be appropriate for some of the proposed controls around junctions furthest away from the shopping parade and school to be dropped (see ANNEXE 7a). However, in addition to this, the local councillors would prefer to downgrade the vast majority of the double yellow lines away from the shopping parade to single yellow lines, operating Mon-Fri 8-10am & 2.30-4.30pm (see ANNEXE 7b).
- 2.25 Whilst the introduction of single yellow lines around junctions might deal with the parking issues at the time they are more likely to occur, it would be inadvisable for motorists to consider parking in these locations at any time. Therefore, were the Committee to agree to the introduction of single yellow lines it might give motorists' the impression that we have given them tacit approval to do so. The introduction of single yellow lines would also increase the need for each of these restrictions to be signed. Double yellow lines do not require such signing as their hours of operation are continuous. Around 30 additional signs and posts would be required to introduce the single yellow line option (ANNEXE 7b).
- 2.26 While officers recommend introducing the controls detailed in ANNEXE 7a, we have also included ANNEXE 7b, which is preferred by local councillors. Should the Committee wish, it could change recommendation (iii) to refer to ANNEXE 7b instead of ANNEXE 7a.

Merrow shopping parade area

- 2.27 We wrote directly to around 400 addresses in 14 roads, as well as the Merrow Residents' Association and Fairway Residents' Association. 5 of the roads consulted are private.
- 2.28 Overall, we received 23 representations. There was 1 general comment as well as 23 that referred to specific roads. 5 of the representations stated support for the proposals, 12 general support, 1 general opposition and 6 stated opposition.
- 2.29 The control of the parking bays within the shopping parade area featured heavily. However, some of the businesses within the parade were concerned about the impact that the introduction of a limited waiting period would have on their staff and clients. Conversely, some questioned the adoption of the proposed 3-hour limited waiting period. Many, including the Merrow Residents' Association, suggested that the proposed limited waiting period was too long.
- 2.30 The 3-hour limited waiting period will prevent all-day parking within the spaces at the parade and encourage the turnover of space. However, it will

accommodate the broad nature of shops present, including a restaurant. It will also provide some flexibility for those living in the flats above the shops.

- 2.31 In respect to the other proposals, some thought that the proposed controls in Merrow Street were too extensive, whilst others thought that they were not extensive enough.
- 2.32 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. The proposals that have resulted from these discussions and are recommended for implementation appear in ANNEXE 9. They are unchanged from the proposals formally advertised.

Shalford area

- 2.33 We wrote directly to around 700 addresses in 23 roads, as well as Shalford Parish Council. 7 of the roads consulted are private.
- 2.34 Overall, we received 81 representations. There were 14 general comments as well as 81 that referred to specific roads. 35 of the representations stated support for the proposals, 29 general support, 8 general opposition and 23 stated opposition.
- 2.35 Concerns were raised about the extent of the controls in Chinthurst Lane. Some wanted more extensive controls to be considered. Meanwhile, others in the neighbouring roads were concerned about the displacement effect that the proposed controls in Chinthurst Lane would have in their roads.
- 2.36 Elsewhere, the proposals elsewhere were broadly welcomed, although those in Poplar Road did generate some comment. Poplar Road was not included within the initial, informal consultation area. However, following discussions with local borough and county councillors and Shalford Parish Council, it, and another proposal in Shalford Lane, were included in the formal advertisement. In respect to Poplar Road, the double yellow line proposals are primarily intended to protect a 90-degree bend and the sightlines of a nearby junction.
- 2.37 In Kings Road, outside the former Methodist Church, the proposal included measures to accommodate a possible vehicle crossover. However, despite being made aware of this over a year ago, the crossover has still yet to be constructed. Therefore, there remains a considerable amount of uncertainty as to whether the crossover will be constructed, and if so, when this might occur.
- 2.38 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. The revised proposals that have resulted from these discussions and are recommended for implementation appear in ANNEXE 11.
- Kings Road – do not progress the proposal outside the Methodist Church until such time that the vehicle crossover is actually constructed. At that stage, include the changes necessary to accommodate it within the next subsequent parking review.

'Ad-hoc' proposals elsewhere

- 2.39 We wrote directly to around 1,400 addresses about proposals in nearly 50 roads, as well as various parish councils and residents' associations.

2.40 Previously the Committee agreed to implement controls in those locations that received no, few or wholly supportive representations. These locations are:

- Spiceall, Compton
- Guildford Road (service road), Effingham,
- Agraria Road, Guildford,
- Cline Road, Guildford,
- Cranley Road, Guildford,
- Ellis Avenue, Guildford,
- Falcon Road, Guildford,
- Josephs Road, Guildford,
- Makenfield Road, Guildford,
- Pewley Hill, Guildford,
- Tormead Road, Guildford,
- Aldershot Road (services road), Guildford,
- Barrack Road, Guildford,
- Manor Road, Guildford,
- Sandy Lane, Send
- Send Road (including service road), Send
- Tannery Lane, Send

2.41 In addition, 124 representations were received about the remainder of the proposed locations. The locations concerned appear below:

- Ash Church Road, Ash
- Foreman Park, Ash
- Ash Hill Road, Ash
- College Road, Ash
- Ash Street and Star Lane, Ash
- Cabell Road 'area', Guildford
- Ferry Lane, Guildford
- Greville Close, Guildford
- Prospect Road 'area', Ash
- Rose Lane, Ripley
- Gomshal Lane and Middle Street, Shere
- South Hill, Guildford
- Poyle Road and The Street, Tongham
- Vale Road, Ash Vale,
- Oak Hill and The Oval, Wood Street Village

ITEM 10

- Worplesdon Road, Guildford
- 2.42 Additionally, proposals for Raymond Crescent were formally advertised. However, due to a procedural issue, the street notices were not erected, as they normally would have been. Because of this, we intend to re-advertise these particular proposals. Nevertheless, the representations already submitted will still be considered, and along with any others received, will be reported to the June 2016 meeting of the Committee.
- 2.43 There were 147 references to specific roads. 28 stated support for the proposals, 27 general support, 20 general opposition and 72 stated opposition.
- 2.44 Some of the proposals generated a considerable number of representations. Indeed, locations such as Ash Street, Ash (38) and Prospect Road, Ash (34) accounted for around half of all the representations received about the 'ad-hoc' proposals.
- 2.45 Ash Church Road and Foreman Park, Ash – the proposals were generally welcomed. However, concerns were raised about the present parking in nearby Foreman Road. This location had not been raised prior to the Committee finalising the scope of the review.
- 2.46 Ash Hill Road and College Road, Ash - concerns were raised about the potential impact on the availability of parking in Ash Hill Road. However, the proposed double yellow lines around the junction are the minimum considered necessary to protect sight lines. In respect to College Road, it was suggested by one representee that the controls at its junction with Ash Hill Road were excessive. Meanwhile, others suggested that there were other issues elsewhere within College Road that should be addressed. The latter had not been raised prior to the Committee finalising the scope of the review.
- 2.47 Ash Street and Star Lane, Ash – The location was originally prioritised following concerns raised by Surrey Police. Site visits and accident data appeared to support those concerns. Indeed, at around the advertisement of proposals, Parking Services was made aware of an incident in Ash Street involving a pedestrian and a passing vehicle. The pedestrian involved made a representation. Notwithstanding, concerns were also raised about the impact that the proposed controls would have on the availability of parking for residents and those dropping off and picking up children from the schools in the vicinity. Similar concerns were expressed about the proposals in Star Lane.
- 2.48 Cabell Road 'area', Guildford – although some minor concerns were raised about the loss of parking space close to junctions, the proposals are primarily intended to improve safety around these features.
- 2.49 Ferry Lane, Guildford – Parking Services was made aware of the creation of a vehicle access and a vehicle crossover application. The proposals sought to accommodate these. Even so, concerns were raised about the loss of parking. Albeit a relatively modest one, Ferry Lane is somewhat detached from the other parking areas within that particular part of the controlled parking zone. It also became apparent that the crossover had not actually been constructed within the licence period granted by Surrey County Council, and that it was only intended to be a temporary facility.

- 2.50 Greville Close, Guildford – the proposal intended to formalise an existing disabled bay that the County Council had introduced on an informal basis for a specific resident. It was allegedly that this space had been misused on a regular basis. Nevertheless, concerns were raised about the wider parking issues within the close. Although allegations of misuse have not been received about a second disabled bay, immediately adjacent to the one for which formalisation is proposed, this second bay is now due to be formalised. This is being advertised separately.
- 2.51 Prospect Road ‘area’, Ash – concerns were raised about the loss of parking associated with the proposals. Although these included parking on alternate sides of the road, thereby creating a ‘chicane effect’, it was suggested by some that the proposals would lead to an increase in vehicle speeds.
- 2.52 Rose Lane, Ripley - the proposal intended to introduce a new formalised disabled bay that the County Council had agreed should be introduced. However, during the course of the advertisement process, the County Council introduced it informally. Concerns were raised about the loss of parking for other residents in the area.
- 2.53 Gomshall Lane and Middle Street, Shere – the proposals were primarily intended to formalise an existing disabled parking bay (Gomshall Lane) and introduce an new facility in the vicinity of the shops (Middle Street). These were broadly welcomed. However, the proposal to improve the turnover of space in the vicinity of the shops and thereby help provide greater opportunities for deliveries was opposed, specifically by Shere Parish Council.
- 2.54 South Hill, Guildford – the proposal intends to improve access and visibility to the existing crossover at No.8a. The resident at the address welcomed this. However, others wanted other changes to be considered, primarily to improve the access at No.8 and maintain / increase the availability of parking. Unlike the access at No.8a, that serving No.8 is already afforded larger setback distances to the adjacent parking bays.
- 2.55 Poyle Road and The Street, Tongham – The Poyle Road Campaign Group expressed support for the proposals to protect the access to the community facilities off Poyle Road. Indeed, they suggested that additional measures should be considered. Tongham Parish Council opposed the proposal. The Parish Council also opposed the provision of an additional disabled parking space in The Street. The Campaign Group supported the proposal if it could be established that there was a demand for it. The proposal was intended to improve accessibility to the shops. It had been suggested by those with mobility issues that the existing disabled bay was often occupied. The existing disabled bay in The Street was provided by the County Council for a specific resident. However, they have been unable to confirm whether this facility is still required. It is also suggested that the space is now often available.
- 2.56 Vale Road, Ash Vale – one representation received opposed the proposal on the basis that it further reduced the availability of parking space. The proposal was developed following concerns about the extents of the existing controls and the ability of larger vehicles, in particular, to park close to the bridge over the canal.
- 2.57 Oak Hill and The Oval, Wood Street Village – Wood Street Village Primary School expressed support for the proposal to control parking in Oak Hill. A

resident living nearby was concerned that the proposal might displace parking into a nearby service road. In respect to The Oval, the proposal is to formalise a disabled parking bay introduced by the County Council for a specific resident. It is suggested that it is being misused. The geometry of the road means that it was not possible for the County Council to introduce the bay outside the house of the resident for which it is intended. The resident outside which the disabled bay has been placed expressed concern about the loss of facility for them and their visitors if the disabled bay is formalised.

2.58 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. The revised proposals that have resulted from these discussions and are recommended for implementation appear in ANNEXE 13. Some of these are revised from those originally advertised.

2.59 The revisions from the proposals advertised are:

- College Road, Ash – curtail the proposed double yellow lines adjacent to No.65 Ash Hill Road, to reflect the increased carriageway width afforded by the fencing at No.65. The controls will now only extend adjacent to the hedge, which runs along the remainder of No.65's property boundary. The hedge often reduces the carriageway width in this section of the road to below the preferred minimum,
- Ash Street, Ash - reduce the restrictions on the northern side of the road so that they only protect a communal access serving Nos.51-55,
- Star Lane, Ash - reduce the restrictions on the western side of the road so that they only protect the access to Ash Library,
- Ferry Lane, Guildford – in view of the fact that the access will now only be a temporary feature, drop the proposals in their entirety. Therefore, the location does not appear in ANNEXE 13,
- Prospect Road 'area', Ash - reduce the extents of the restrictions on both sides of the road in the vicinity of the various junctions,
- Middle Street, Shere – drop the proposal to introduce limited waiting parking in the vicinity of the shops,
- The Street, Tongham – drop the proposal to introduce an additional disabled parking bay on the west side of the road and retain the existing disabled facility on the east side of the road. Therefore, the location does not appear in ANNEXE 13.

3. OPTIONS:

3.1 The Committee needs to decide whether to implement the proposals as recommended, make changes, or not to progress some, or all of the proposals. If there was a desire to increase the amount of restriction as a result of comments received, the proposals would have to be advertised again. The controls recommended for implementation have been discussed, and in the majority of cases have been amended, as a result of the discussions with local borough and county councillors.

- 3.2 In respect to the proposals for the Fairland estate, the Committee needs to decide whether to implement the proposals recommended by officers (ANNEXE 7a), or the ones preferred by the local councillors (ANNEXE 7b).
- 3.3 If the Committee agrees the recommendations, it is likely that the implementation will take place in mid-2016.
- 3.4 The Committee could choose not to make the orders. However, the issues that have been raised, and in many cases confirmed by the consultations, would remain unresolved.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Letters associated with the informal and formal consultations have been distributed to over 5,000 addresses, various other interested parties such as parish council, community organisations and residents' associations. This has resulted in over 6,000 'hits' on the associated pages on Guildford Borough Council's website. In the case of the formal consultations, statutory consultees have also been notified.
- 4.2 The feedback and proposals have been circulated to relevant local borough and county councillors, and meetings held with many of them to discuss this and possible amendments to the proposals.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 We anticipate that the overall cost of the current review will not be more than £50,000 and this can be met from on-street parking surplus. This figure covers both the geographic and ad-hoc elements of the review. The precise amount will ultimately depend on the number of locations where we subsequently introduce controls.
- 5.2 Existing resources will be used to conduct the consultations and the only additional expenditure will be postage.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Blue badge holders can park in disabled parking bays without time limit or on yellow lines, not subject to loading restrictions, 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 The proposals will affect all road users in the areas where amendments are proposed and particularly residents. The proposals will be publicised and the comments received given carefully considered.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below.
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

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 and where large vehicles utilise relatively narrow roads.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 We have carefully considered the feedback received and recommend the Committee agrees:
 - (i) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, shown in ANNEXE 3,
 - (ii) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Effingham Junction, shown in ANNEXE 5,
 - (iii) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls, covering Fairlands, shown in ANNEXE 7a,
 - (iv) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the Merrow shopping parade area, shown in ANNEXE 9,
 - (v) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Shalford, shown in ANNEXE 11,

- (vi) that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the 'ah-hoc' locations, shown in ANNEXE 13.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals set out in recommendations (i) to (vi), it is likely that this will take place in mid-2016, alongside the controls the Committee previously agreed to implement at its December 2015 meeting. This would involve publishing a public notice, erecting street notices, placing documentation on deposit and writing to those in the immediate vicinity of the proposals, and that have made representations, at the time the proposals are to be implemented.
- 10.2 In relation to the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane and the small number of other locations the Committee agreed to advertise at its December 2015 meeting, these are currently being advertised / will be advertised in the coming weeks. Any representations received as a result will be reported to the June 2016 meeting of the Committee. If we were to subsequently implement any controls, this is expected to take place in mid-to-late 2016.

Contact Officer:

Andrew Harkin, On-street Parking Coordinator, Guildford Borough Council
(01483) 444535

Consulted:

Surrey Police and other statutory consultees
Residents
Businesses
Community groups and residents' associations
Parish Councils
Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

- 1 - Summary of representations – Geographic area and 'Ad-hoc' proposals
- 2 - Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations – representations (available online or on request),
- 3 - Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations – revised proposals for which authority to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is being sought,
- 4 - Effingham Junction – representations (available online or on request),
- 5 - Effingham Junction – revised proposals for which authority to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is being sought,
- 6 - Fairlands – representations (available online or on request),
- 7 - a & b - Fairlands – revised proposals for which authority to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is being sought,
- 8 - Meroo shopping parade area – representations (available online or on request),
- 9 - Meroo shopping parade area – revised proposals for which authority to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is being sought,

www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford

ITEM 10

- 10 - Shalford – representations (available online or on request),
- 11 - Shalford – revised proposals for which authority to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is being sought,
- 12 - 'Ad-hoc' locations – representations (available online or on request),
- 13 - 'Ad-hoc' locations – revised proposals for which authority to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) is being sought,

Sources/background papers:

- Item 9, Guildford Local Committee, 11 December 2013
 - Item 13, Guildford Local Committee, 24 September 2014
 - Items 15 & 16, Guildford Local Committee, 17 June 2015
 - Item 12, Guildford Local Committee, 8 December 2015
-