

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)**

**DATE: WEDNESDAY 22 JUNE 2016**



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

**SUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW – PROPOSALS FOR BURPHAM AREA AND ‘AD-HOC’ LOCATIONS**

**DIVISION(S): ALL**

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report presents the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals in the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane 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 (TRO) is made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls in the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, shown in ANNEXE 3,
- (ii) that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the ‘ad-hoc’ locations, shown in ANNEXE 5, and that the proposals in Millmead Terrace are not progressed at the present time.

**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 the

Committee agreed to progress around 20. Furthermore, the review includes changes to accommodate disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and access arrangements for new and existing developments.

- 1.3 As a result of the informal consultation stage undertaken in late 2014 / early 2015, at its June 2015 meeting, and the Committee agreed to progress the review in two phases.

#### **Schemes awaiting implementation**

- 1.4 It decided 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.
- 1.5 At meetings held in December 2015 and March 2016, the Committee considered the feedback from the formal advertisement and agreed to implement controls in the roads listed below:

#### **Avondale area around Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations**

Avondale, Birch Way, Cypress Grove, Lysons Avenue, Station Road East, Station Road West, Wellesley Close, Wentworth Close, Wentworth Crescent

#### **Effingham Junction**

Effingham Common Road, Old Lane & Old Lane (service road)

#### **Fairlands**

Brocks Drive, Brooke Forest, Dynevor Place, Envis Way, Fairlands Avenue, Fairlands Avenue (service Road), Fairlands Road, Gumbrells Close, Kiln Meadows, Littlefield Close, Littlefield Way, Louis Fields, Quakers Way, St Michael's Avenue, Sandpit Heath & Wallace Close

#### **Merrow shopping parade area**

Epsom Road, Merrow Street & Sadlers Close

#### **Shalford**

Ashcroft, Atherton Close, Chinthurst Lane, Dagden Road, Kings Road, Mitchells Close, Orchard Road, Poplar Road, Shalford Lane, Station Road, Station Row (private) & Tillingbourne Road

#### **Ad-hoc locations**

Agraria Road (Guildford), Aldershot Road service road (Guildford), Ash Church Road (Ash), Ash Hill Road (Ash), Ash Street and Star Lane (Ash), Barrack Road (Guildford), Cabell Road 'area' (Guildford), Cline Road (Guildford), College Road (Ash), Cranley Road (Guildford), Ellis Avenue (Guildford), Falcon Road (Guildford), Foreman Park (Ash), Gomshal Lane and Middle Street (Shere), Greville Close (Guildford), Guildford Road service road (Effingham), Josephs Road (Guildford), Manor Road (Guildford), Pewley Hill (Guildford), Oak Hill and The Oval (Wood Street Village), Poyle Road (Tongham), Prospect Road 'area' (Ash), Rose Lane (Ripley), Tormead Road (Guildford), Sandy Lane (Send), Send Road including service road (Send), South Hill (Guildford), Spiceall (Compton), Tannery Lane (Send), Vale Road (Ash Vale) & Worplesdon Road (Guildford)

It is anticipated that these changes will be implemented by the end of August 2016.

### **Proposals with representations to be considered**

- 1.6 At its June 2015 meeting the Committee also agreed to undertake a further stage of informal consultation, including public exhibitions, in respect to the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, and in respect to Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham) and School Lane (Pirbright), for officers to discuss the issues further with the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 1.7 At its December 2015 meeting the Committee then agreed to formally advertise proposals in the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham) and School Lane (Pirbright). It also agreed to formally advertise 8 additional 'ad-hoc' changes. The latter primarily involve accommodating disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and improving access arrangements for new and existing developments.
- 1.8 This report summarises the feedback received as a result of the formal consultations in the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane and other 'ad-hoc' locations and recommends the next steps. This is the final committee stage for the present parking review.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

- 2.1 The formal advertisement of proposals took place between 22 April and 13 May 2016. The proposals involved 20 roads. These encompassed one geographic area (Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane), and 12 'ad-hoc' locations, including Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham), and School Lane (Pirbright). A number of the 'ad-hoc' locations are associated with accommodating disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and improving access arrangements for new and existing developments. These are listed in 2.41.
- 2.2 We wrote directly to over 1,000 addresses. A public notice was also published in the Surrey Advertiser newspaper. Additionally, over 100 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 a link to the Borough Councils' website. 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 609 'hits'. Overall, 129 representations were received. Over 90% of the representations were submitted online. The majority of the proposals received representations. Those in Friars Gate, Ward Street and Woking Road, Guildford, did not. Some of the representations referred to proposals in more than one road. In total 167 location-specific references to proposals were made. A table summarising the representations appears in ANNEXE 1.
- 2.4 To help gain an overall impression of the feedback we have analysed the comments. ANNEXE 1 also details whether the comments were supportive or

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

opposed to the proposals. We have also categorised those comments generally supportive and generally opposed, and where changes were suggested, described their general nature. This analysis is presented to provide a general impression of the feedback received, but it is important that each representation is considered.

- 2.5 This report is considering 55 representations associated with the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, and 74 representations associated with the 'ad-hoc' locations.

### **Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane**

- 2.6 We wrote directly to around 450 addresses in 15 roads, as well as to the Burpham Community Association and Burpham Neighbourhood Forum. 8 of the roads consulted are private.
- 2.7 Overall, we received 55 representations. These produced 93 comments about specific locations. There were 3 general comments as well as 87 that referred to the proposals in specific roads. A further 3 comments were made about the need for additional controls elsewhere within the area. There were 33 comments stating support for the proposals in specific locations, 25 offering general support, 15 general opposition and 20 stated opposition.
- 2.8 Of the 25 that were generally supportive, 15 wanted more restrictive controls, whilst 9 wanted less restrictive controls. 1 wanted other measures also to be considered. Of the 15 generally opposed, 2 wanted more restrictive controls whilst 13 wanted less restrictive controls.
- 2.9 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals.

### **Shopping parade**

- 2.10 The shopping parade encompasses Barton Place, Kingpost Parade and part of London Road.
- 2.11 There were 7 comments that specifically referred to the parade. 5 of the 7 were either fully supportive (2) or generally supportive with revisions (3). Those generally supportive wanted more restrictive controls. Primarily this involved a shortening of the proposed limited waiting period. The 3-hour limit proposed has been chosen to accommodate the wide variety of businesses present within the parade, which include a restaurant and hairdresser.
- 2.12 There were 2 comments opposed to controls. One suggested that the present uncontrolled arrangement works fine. The other was from a representative of the Barton Place Residents' organisation. They have been in dispute with Surrey County Council about the status of Barton Place for a number of years. They claim that the area is private and not public highway. They are opposed to controls on this basis. They also suggest that if controls are to be implemented, that they would want to see the parking spaces reserved for residents. During the previous stages of consultation the turnover of space and its availability for visitors in the area around the shops was the primary concern raised. Those living in the flats above the shops within the remainder of the parade would be similarly affected by the proposed controls, as would those working within the shops. It is considered important that there is a turnover of parking within spaces near the shops.

- 2.13 Surrey County Council has previously considered complaints from the Barton Place Residents' organisation about the status of the road. The County Council has concluded that the road is public highway.
- 2.14 If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals in Barton Place, the decision could be open to legal challenge at the High Court. However, if the Committee does not proceed with the implementation, it may suggest that there is doubt that the road is public highway.
- 2.15 In terms of the feedback received from the local ward and divisional councillors, Cllrs Ellwood and Piper suggest that all the proposals in the Shopping parade should be implemented as advertised. Cllr Halliday suggests that more investigations should be undertaken in respect to the status of the road. Surrey County Council Highway officers have indicated that they are satisfied that the road is public highway.
- 2.16 Therefore, having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, it is recommended that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 3.
- 2.17 In the section of Kingpost Parade that is private, the management company intend to keep the matter under review, and should the need arise, explore the possibility of using a private parking enforcement contractor.

### **Burpham Lane**

- 2.18 There were 59 comments specifically about Burpham Lane. 22 of these stated support, whilst 13 were generally supportive but suggested supported with revisions. 12 stated opposition with a further 12 generally opposed.
- 2.19 However, there are three distinct sections to Burpham Lane; the section between London Road and the 90-degree bend, the section from the 90-degree bend to Clay Lay, and the cul-de-sac off this part of the road. The views about the proposals in the three sections varied.
- 2.20 In the section between London Road and the 90-degree bend the proposal is to introduce double yellow lines throughout.
- 2.21 37 comments were specifically made about these proposals. 11 stated support. 7 were generally supportive but with revisions. The latter expressed a desire for less restrictive controls. 19 comments either stated opposition (9) or were generally opposed and preferred less restrictive controls (10).
- 2.22 Concerns were raised about the loss of parking for those using the cricket pavilion, for the nursery during the day and the bridge club on Tuesday evenings. Shortcomings about the adequacy of the car park at Sutherland Memorial Park and the links across the park were seen as obstacles to using these facilities, particularly in the dark.
- 2.23 The proximity of junctions, major points of access, existing traffic calming features, and the difficulties caused by parking opposite driveways limits the opportunities to retain parking. Indeed, as a result of the feedback expressed at the previous public exhibitions, the limited opportunities to retain parking were omitted due to the concerns raised.

## ITEM 10

- 2.24 In the section between 90-degree bend and Clay Lane the proposal intends to introduce a combination of single and double yellow lines and unrestricted areas. The need for residents to park on-street is greater in this section of the road.
- 2.25 21 comments were specifically made about these proposals. 10 stated support. 6 were generally supportive but with revisions. 4 of the 6 expressed a desire for more restrictive controls. Primarily, this involved the prioritisation of space for residents using permits. 5 comments either stated opposition (3) or were generally opposed and preferred more or less restrictive controls (2).
- 2.26 The need for a residents' permit scheme was not raised as an issue prior to the start of the review. Nevertheless, it was offered as a possible option during the initial stage of consultation. Across the area, only around 18% of respondents suggested that this was their preferred solution. As a result, the introduction of a permit scheme was discounted. Instead, the review has primarily focused on dealing with the concerns about safety and access. These issues have been raised prior to, and during the course of the review.
- 2.27 Nevertheless, as a result of the feedback from the previous stages of consultation, the proposals in this section of Burpham Lane have been made less restrictive, and will provide more space for residents at times when a greater number of them are at home.
- 2.28 The only comment about the cul-de-sac section of the road, which Burpham Primary School submitted, stated support.
- 2.29 Those making representations also raised concerns about more general highway issues. These included the current speed of traffic using the road (18), its use as a 'rat run' (10) and the need for traffic calming (8). Some of those seeking revisions and opposed to the proposals in the section between London Road and the 90-degree bend suggested that the proposed parking controls might exacerbate their concerns. During the advertisement period, a separate public meeting took place about traffic issues within the road. The County Council intend to undertake a review of the traffic movement issues within Burpham Lane in due course.
- 2.30 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 3.

### **Marlyns Drive**

- 2.31 10 comments were specifically made about proposals in this location. 2 stated support for the proposals. 4 suggested more restrictive controls were necessary. It was suggested that these would be required due to the potential for displacement, as a result of the controls proposed in Burpham Lane. 4 stated opposition to the proposals.
- 2.32 Again, a number of concerns were raised about the current speed of traffic using the road (5), its use as a 'rat run' (2) and the need for traffic calming (8). The County Council's review of traffic movement will also consider Marlyns Drive.

- 2.33 As a result of the feedback from the previous stages of consultation, the proposals in Marlins Drive have already been extended to increase protection near to its junction with Burpham Lane.
- 2.34 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 3.

#### **Burnet Avenue**

- 2.35 5 comments were specifically made about the proposals in this location. 2 stated support. A further 2 gave general support but felt that more restrictions should be considered elsewhere within the road. 1 representee stated opposition, due to the loss of facility for those living in nearby Raynham Close.
- 2.36 As a result of the feedback from the previous stages of consultation, the proposals in Burnet Avenue have already been extended to increase protection near to its junction with New Inn Lane.
- 2.37 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 3.

#### **Howard Ridge**

- 2.38 3 comments were specifically made about the proposals in this location. 1 stated support. Another gave general support but suggested less restrictive controls were more appropriate in Howard Ridge, or failing that, a residents' parking scheme. There was one representee generally opposed suggesting that if controls were to be introduced more restrictive measures should be considered, such as the introduction of marked bays.
- 2.39 As a result of the feedback from the previous stages of consultation, the proposals in Howard Ridge were developed to improve the protection of its junction with Burpham Lane and at various points within its length.
- 2.40 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 3.

#### **'Ad-hoc' proposals elsewhere**

- 2.41 As part of the most recent formal advertisement we proposed further 'ad-hoc' controls. We wrote directly to around 600 addresses in 12 roads about further proposals. We also wrote to the various Parish Councils involved. As a result, 74 representations were received about the remainder of the proposed 'ad-hoc' locations (ANNEXE 4). The locations concerned appear below:

- Dorking Road, Chilworth (10 representations)
- Friars Gate, Guildford (No representations)
- Greville Close, Guildford (2 representations)

## ITEM 10

- High Street, Ripley (10 representations)
- Lower Road, Effingham (9 representations)
- Millmead Terrace, Guildford (14 representations)
- New Cross Road, Guildford (2 representations)
- Raymond Crescent, Guildford (13 representations)
- School Lane / Dawneys Road, Pirbright (14 representations)
- Ward Street, Guildford (No representations)
- Woking Road, Guildford (No representations)

2.42 In total, there were 74 representations about the 'ad-hoc references to specific roads. Overall, 14 stated support for the proposals. A further 24 offered general support (14 preferring more restrictive controls, 3 less restrictive, 7 other). 21 stated opposition to the proposals. A further 15 were generally opposed (5 preferring more restrictive controls, 7 less restrictive, 3 other).

2.43 Dorking Road, Chilworth – There were 10 representations about the proposals. 3 of these stated support. 2 offered general support but suggested the controls should be more restrictive. 2 stated opposition. A further 2 suggested general opposition but that the controls should be less restrictive, whilst another suggested alternative solutions, such as the creation of additional parking spaces. Prior to the formal advertisement of the proposals, discussions with St Martha's Parish Council had already resulted in the extents of the proposals being reduced. Therefore, the proposed controls are the bare minimum that realistically we could consider to protect effectively the various points of access onto Dorking Road.

2.44 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 5.

2.45 Greville Close, Guildford – There were 2 representations about the proposals. 1 stated support. The other stated opposition on the basis that more extensive measures were required. The proposals were developed after concerns about misuse of the disabled spaces. We have not seen any evidence to suggest that there is widespread support for more extensive parking controls.

2.46 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 5.

2.47 High Street, Ripley – There were 10 representations about the proposals. 2 stated support. A further 4 offered general support (2 suggesting the controls should be more restrictive, 1 suggesting the controls should be less restrictive and 1 other). 1 stated opposition. A further 3 generally opposed the proposals (2 suggesting that more restrictive controls were required and 1 other). Concerns were raised about the overall lack of parking within Ripley. Some suggested that the car park at the village hall should be better utilised. Others

suggested residents' parking should be considered. The issues the current pavement and verge parking causes to other road users was also raised as an issue, as was the speed of traffic. The proposals to increase the no return period within the time limited bays were developed following concerns raised about the misuse of the spaces by long-stay parkers.

- 2.48 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 5.
- 2.49 Lower Road, Effingham – There were 9 representations about the proposals. 1 of these stated support. 7 offered general support (6 suggesting the controls should be more restrictive and 1 suggesting the controls should be less restrictive). 1 stated opposition. The latter was from the Effingham Residents' Association. They are concerned about the potential for displacement and suggested additional controls should only be considered if alternative parking is provided, either by reengineering the highway, the school providing the spaces directly themselves, or by entering agreements with other organisations in the area that have car parks. The proposals were developed following concerns raised about unbroken lengths of parked vehicles on the approach to the bend to the north-east of the school, and the issues that this causes.
- 2.50 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 5.
- 2.51 Millmead Terrace, Guildford – There were 14 representations about the proposals. 2 of these stated support. 3 offered general support (1 suggesting the controls should be more restrictive and 2 suggesting that other options should be considered). 7 stated opposition. A further 2 generally opposed the proposals, both suggesting that more restrictive controls elsewhere in the area were required.
- 2.52 The proposal is to convert the parking restriction opposite the garages below Condor Court, and marked by a single yellow line which applies Monday to Saturday 8.30am to 6pm, into a restriction which applies 24 hours a day, marked by a double yellow. Currently, vehicles parked opposite the garages greatly restrict or prevent access to them and the intention of the proposal is to make access easier. As a result of the pressure on on-street parking the area opposite is parked upon, particularly in the evenings and on Sundays, when the current restriction does not apply. The garage owners can currently obtain permits for their vehicles to park on-street because the garages cannot be used. This adds to the parking pressure in the area. The general lack of space, and issues particularly in the evening were cited as reasons for not making the change.
- 2.53 The best use of space would be achieved if the area opposite the garages was clear of parked cars so the garages could be used. The owners being able to use the the garages would reduce the number of permits for on-street parking and this would reduce the pressure on-street parking. However, the success

## ITEM 10

of this depends on the ability to discourage parking in the area opposite the garages. The area is not currently restricted in the evenings and on Sundays when demand for space is high and enforcement resources, are limited.

- 2.54 If the proposal was introduced and there was still regular parking opposite the garages, despite the restriction and enforcement, then this would be the worse case situation. The owners of the garages would still have the risk of the access being blocked. They would have a case for retaining permits and the area opposite the garages could not be used for additional parking in the evening without risking a fine.
- 2.55 All the representations made in favour of the proposal want clear access to the garages. While residents and some of those opposed feel that there is often no other choice but to park in the area. This means there is a risk that a restriction even backed by enforcement would not be effective.
- 2.56 Officers have recently received a survey conducted by local residents, which shows there is a strong wish to make changes to the current restrictions to provide more space for residents. These proposals could be looked at during the next review and could take away some of the pressure to park in the area opposite the garages. This would provide a greater chance that a 24-hour restriction in this area would be successful.
- 2.57 The next review is due to start towards the end of this year and depending on the size and scope of the review the implementation of its findings could be up to two years after the start.
- 2.58 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between access and the availability of space, it is recommended not to implement the change now, but to look at it again as part of a review of all the parking restriction in the Millmead area.
- 2.59 New Cross Road, Guildford – the proposal intends to improve access to the existing crossover at No.49a. The access has been blocked repeatedly by those parking on the existing single yellow lines. The resident at the address welcomed this. The other changes within the road are technical ones to ensure that the traffic regulation order matches the controls in-situ. The latter will not involve any actual changes to the controls in place.
- 2.60 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between access and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 5.
- 2.61 Raymond Crescent, Guildford – We had advertised the proposals for Raymond Crescent previously. However, due to a procedural issue, the street notices were not erected, as they normally would have been. Despite this, a number of representations were received. However, to ensure that the correct process has been followed, we re-advertised these particular proposals. Representations from the first consultation, and the most recent one are reported. In all cases, those responding previously have responded again. Others submitted additional representations.

- 2.62 There were 13 representations about the proposals. 1 stated support. A further 1 offered general support suggesting that other controls in the area should be more restrictive. 8 stated opposition to the proposal. A further 3 generally opposed the proposals suggesting the general need for less restrictive controls. The changes were proposed as a result of the creation of a new vehicle crossover at No.62. This was agreed by Surrey County Council Highways. When the crossover was constructed, the affected part of the parking bay was removed. It was replaced by an advisory, access protection marking. The proposal seeks to convert this advisory marking into a formalised control. Within a controlled parking zone, all kerb space is controlled. Yellow line waiting restrictions protect all the other vehicle crossovers within Raymond Crescent. Therefore, it would seem unreasonable to deny access to the crossover at No.62.
- 2.63 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between access and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 5.
- 2.64 School Lane / Dawneys Road, Pirbright – There were 14 representations about the proposals. 11 were specifically about those in School Lane. 3 were about those in Dawneys Road.
- 2.65 In respect to School Lane, there were 11 representations. 1 stated support. A further 7 offered general support (1 suggesting more restrictive controls were appropriate, 2 suggesting less restrictive controls were appropriate and 4 suggesting other measures). There was 1 representation stating opposition. A further 2 generally opposed the proposals, both suggesting the need for other measures. Concerns were raised about the impact the controls would have on the availability of parking during the school run. Some suggested alternative parking facilities should be provided. Some believed the removal of parking would have a negative impact on vehicle speeds, causing them to increase.
- 2.66 The proposals were developed following concerns raised by the Police about parking, primarily during the school run. However, parking close to junctions and major points of access is inadvisable at any time and could cause issues. Prior to their advertisement, a meeting was held to discuss them. Various interested parties, including the police, the schools, the parish council and the ward and divisional councillors, attended this.
- 2.67 In respect to Dawneys Road, there were 3 representations. 1 stated support. 1 offered general support, suggesting more restrictive controls were appropriate. There was 1 representation stating opposition. Concerns were raised about the possible displacement of parking into Dawneys Road. However, perhaps of greatest significance is that the road's owner, the Ministry of Defence, were satisfied with the proposals.
- 2.68 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with them about the proposals. Having considered the feedback and the balance between safety, access, traffic flow and the availability of space, both they and officers believe that the proposals should be implemented as advertised as they appear in ANNEXE 5.

### **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 If the Committee agrees the recommendations, it is likely that the implementation will take place by the end of November 2016.
- 3.3 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 1,000 addresses, various other interested parties such as parish council, community organisations and residents' associations. This has resulted in over 600 'hits' on the associated pages on Guildford Borough Council's website. Statutory consultees have also been notified.
- 4.2 The feedback and proposals have been circulated to relevant local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with many of them about 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.

<b>7. LOCALISM:</b>
---------------------

- 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.

<b>8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:</b>
-------------------------------

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.

<b>9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>
---

- 9.1 We have carefully considered the feedback received and recommend the Committee agrees:
- (iii) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls in the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, shown in ANNEXE 3,
  - (i) that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the 'ah-hoc' locations, shown in ANNEXE 5, and that the proposals in Millmead Terrace are not progressed at the present time.

**10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals set out in recommendations (i) and (ii), it is likely that this will take place by the end of November 2016. 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 These proposals are likely to be implemented after the proposals the Committee has already agreed to implement at its December 2015 and March 2016 meetings, which are due to be introduced by the end of August 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 - Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane – representations (available online or on request),
- 3 - Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane – – revised proposals for which authority to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is being sought,
- 4 - 'Ad-hoc' locations – representations (available online or on request),
- 5 - '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
- Item 10, Guildford Local Committee, 23 March 2016