

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

DATE: Tuesday 19 September 2017



LEAD OFFICER: Andrew Harkin, On-Street parking Co-ordinator

SUBJECT: Guildford On-Street Parking Review – Consideration of representations and authority to implement proposals

DIVISION(S): Guildford South-East, Guildford South-West, Shalford and Worplesdon

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report presents the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals for new or changed parking restrictions listed in paragraph 1.2. The Committee is asked to consider the comments received and decide whether or not to make traffic regulation orders needed to introduce the proposals.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree:

- (i) That, having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, 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 as shown in ANNEXE 3, but that the proposals in Pewley Hill (upper) and Tormead Road 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 At its meeting held on 13 December 2016 the Committee agreed to amend the way that Parking Services conducts its reviews and streamline the process. It also agreed the scope of the present review and that there should be two streams of work. The first includes proposals where there appeared to be strong support for change or necessary change. These areas are listed below and were reported to the July 2017 meeting of the Committee.
- Alresford Road, Annandale Road, Duncan Drive, Maori Road, Millmead area (including Bury Fields, Bury Street, Lawn Road and Millmead Terrace), St Omer Road, Sycamore Road, The Oval, Upperton Road, Vicarage Gate, Woodbridge Road.
- 1.2 The Committee also agreed to develop proposals in a number of other locations, in consultation with the local borough and county councillors. These proposals were subsequently developed, agreed at the Committees's 22 March 2017 meeting, and formally advertised between 7 July and 4 August 2017. These locations are listed below and are the subject of this report:
- Alresford Road, Artillery Terrace, Brodie Road, Chantry View Road, Chapel Street, Cline Road, Cross Lanes, Downside Road, Elmside, Epsom Road, Jenner Road, Josephs Road, Linden Road, Lower Edgeborough Road, Mountside, Old Farm Road, One Tree Hill Road, Pewley Hill (lower and upper), Quarry Street, Queens Road, St Luke's Square, South Hill, Spiceall (Compton), Stocton Close, Stoke Road, The Oval (Wood Street Village), Tormead Road and Warren Road.
- 1.3 This report presents the representations resulting from the advertisement of proposals in the locations highlighted in 1.2.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The formal advertisement of proposals for the areas listed in 1.2 took place between 7 July and 4 August 2017. The proposals encompassed 29 locations. A number of these locations are associated with accommodating disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and improving access arrangements for new and existing developments.
- 2.2 We wrote directly to over 1,200 addresses in and around the areas involved in the proposals. Public notices were also published in the Surrey Advertiser newspaper and online at the public-notices.co.uk website. Additionally, almost 200 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 (Millmead House, Guildford Library, Ash Library and Horsley Library). 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 around 275 'hits'. Overall, 97 representations were received. Over 93% of the representations were submitted online. The majority of the proposals received representations. Indeed, only those in Alresford Road, Old Farm Road, Stocton Close, Stoke Road and The Oval (Wood Street Village) did not.

- Alresford Road, Guildford (0 representations)
- Artillery Terrace, Guildford (1 representations)
- Brodie Road, Guildford (1 representations)
- Chantry View Road, Guildford (4 representations)
- Chapel Street, Guildford (2 representations)
- Cline Road, Guildford (1 representations)
- Cross Lanes, Guildford (4 representations)
- Downside Road / One Tree Hill Road / Warren Road, Guildford (13 representations)
- Elmside, Guildford (7 representations)
- Epsom Road, Guildford (3 representations)
- Jenner Road, Guildford (2 representations)
- Josephs Road, Guildford (2 representations)
- Linden Road, Guildford (1 representations)
- Lower Edgeborough Road, Guildford (15 representations)
- Mountside, Guildford (4 representations)
- Old Farm Road, Guildford (0 representations)
- Pewley Hill (lower), Guildford (4 representations)
- Pewley Hill (upper), Guildford (3 representations)
- Quarry Street, Guildford (8 representations)
- Queens Road, Guildford (1 representations)
- St Luke's Square, Guildford (16 representations)
- South Hill, Guildford (3 representations)
- Spiceall, Compton (1 representations),
- Stocton Close, Guildford (0 representations)
- Stoke Road, Guildford (0 representations)
- The Oval, Wood Street Village (0 representations)
- Tormead Road, Guildford (2 representations)

2.4 A table summarising the representations appears in Annex 1. To help gain an overall impression of the feedback we have analysed the comments. Therefore, Annex 1 also details our view of whether the comments were supportive or 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 In the case of the joint proposals encompassing Downside Road, One Tree Hill Road and Warren Road, some of the representations refer to specific elements of the proposals in particular roads. Therefore, both these and those

expressing opinions that are more general have been analysed in more detail. This is also presented in ANNEXE 1.

- 2.6 The full representations, with officer comments, are shown in ANNEXE 2. The representations were circulated to ward and divisional members for comments and suggests. Cllrs Adrian Chandler, Angela Goodwin, Caroline Reeves and David Goodwin responded in support of the recommendations for the proposals in their wards and divisions.

Alresford Road (convert part of existing limited waiting shared-use parking place outside No.15 to a disabled only parking place)

- 2.7 We wrote directly to 12 addresses in and around Alresford Road.
- 2.8 We received 0 representations.
- 2.9 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Artillery Terrace (convert part of existing single yellow line outside No.1 to a limited waiting shared-use parking place)

- 2.10 We wrote directly to 71 addresses in and around Artillery Terrace.
- 2.11 We received 1 representation. This was from a resident that lives immediately adjacent to the proposal. They objected to the proposal.
- 2.12 The proposal involves converting a single yellow line, which was previously provided to allow access to two former garages, into a parking bay. The former parking facilities have been converted to living/office space, and as such, vehicular access to them is no longer required.
- 2.13 What the representee is suggesting is that we should maintain, in perpetuity, their ability to possibly convert the building(s) back into parking facilities, without the need to amend the parking controls. Of course, the same principle could be applied to any property with a frontage onto the public highway.
- 2.14 Clearly, if there was a desire by the property-owners to convert the buildings back into parking facilities, any changes necessary to the parking controls to accommodate this could be included within a s.278 agreement associated with the planning consent.
- 2.15 There is great demand for on-street parking in this particular locality. The opportunities to increase parking provision are extremely limited. The proposed area is one of the few areas that remain available to improve the on-street parking situation for fellow residents.
- 2.16 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Brodie Road (convert existing single yellow line outside Nos.20&21 to a double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction)

- 2.17 We wrote directly to 29 addresses in Brodie Road.
- 2.18 We received 1 representation. This was from a resident of Brodie Road.

- 2.19 The proposal intends to improve access and traffic movement in Brodie Road.
- 2.20 The representation did not refer to the proposal but instead raised concerns about the traffic and parking situation in neighbouring Sydenham Road. We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review. The situation in Sydenham Road had not been raised as an issue previously. Therefore, it was not considered within the review's scope.
- 2.21 Considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review. Nevertheless, it may be possible for the issues in Sydenham Road to be given further consideration during a future review.
- 2.22 Nevertheless, the wider highway concerns raised about Sydenham Road have been forwarded on to my colleagues and Surrey County Council Highways.
- 2.23 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Chantry View Road (convert existing limited waiting shared-use parking place on the west side of road near Chantry Quarry to a double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction)

- 2.24 We wrote directly to 29 addresses in and around Chantry View Road.
- 2.25 We received 4 representations. All were from residents of Chantry View Road and the surrounding roads. There were 2 comments stating support for the proposals. These were from residents of Chantry View Road. The 1 representation offering general support and 1 generally opposed were from residents of Chantry Quarry.
- 2.26 We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review.
- 2.27 The representations from Chantry Quarry were concerned about the provision of parking for themselves and their visitors and the loss of facility associated with the proposal. Chantry Quarry is a private road / gated development. As such, it does not qualify for the permit scheme. The area between the rear of the footway and the gate is also private. Therefore, the control of parking and prevention of u-turns in this area would be an issue for those responsible for its management to address.
- 2.28 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Chapel Street (TECHNICAL CHANGE – change TRO to match controls in-situ, and also remove the need to mark the double yellow lines within the pedestrian zone)

- 2.29 We wrote directly to 72 addresses in and around Chapel Street.
- 2.30 We received 2 representations. Both were from residents that have access onto Chapel Street.

ITEM 10

- 2.31 The proposal is effectively a technical change to the traffic regulation order, so that it matches the parking restriction markings present.
- 2.32 Although both representations were generally supportive of the proposals, they would prefer to see more restrictive controls to help prevent access issues caused by the very short-stay / transient parking activity associated with the nearby fast food restaurants.
- 2.33 In any location, quick stops are harder to deter by enforcement as drivers tend to be close to their vehicles and can drive away if they see an enforcement officer nearby. Given the nature of the parking activity, more restrictive controls are unlikely to deter motorists from stopping to allow passengers to board and alight, and load or unload, any more than the existing double yellow lines. Nevertheless, we will increase enforcement and look at other ways to try to improve the situation.
- 2.34 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Cline Road (convert part of existing permit only parking place outside No.78 to a disabled only parking place)

- 2.35 We wrote directly to 25 addresses in Cline Road.
- 2.36 We received 1 representation. This was from a resident of Cline Road. They stated support for the proposal.
- 2.37 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Cross Lanes (convert existing single yellow line outside Mathon Lodge and Mathon Court to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction)

- 2.38 We wrote directly to 64 addresses in Cross Lanes.
- 2.39 We received 4 representations. All came from residents of Mathon Court. There were 2 comments stating support for the proposals. 1 representation was general opposed and 1 stated opposition.
- 2.40 We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were about the parking situation adjacent to the access to Mathon Court. The proposals are intended to improve visibility for those wishing to access and egress Mathon Court at times when the present single yellow line controls do not operate.
- 2.41 Other parking bays and lengths of single yellow line in the area may not be situated as conveniently as those that currently protect the access to Mathon Court. Nevertheless, significant opportunities to park are available, which do not impact access and egress to Mathon Court.
- 2.42 The representation generally opposed to the proposal wanted greater prioritisation of the parking bays for permit-holders. The availability of parking in Cross Lanes, and need for greater prioritisation, has not previously been raised as an issue. There is currently 1 permit-holder in Cross Lanes.

- 2.43 Considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review. Nevertheless, if the number of permit-holders were to increase, it may be possible to consider need for greater prioritisation during a future parking review.
- 2.44 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Downside Road / One Tree Hill Road / Warren Road (introduce double yellow line, no waiting at any time restrictions around junction and bend)

- 2.45 We wrote directly to 31 addresses in Downside Road, One Tree Hill Road and Warren Road.
- 2.46 We received 13 representations. These were primarily from residents of Downside Road and Warren Road. 4 representations stated support, whilst 5 were generally supportive. 4 were opposed to the proposals. Of those that were generally supportive, all 5 wanted more restrictive controls unrelated to the proposals.
- 2.47 However, opinions about the specific elements of the proposals differed. In respect to Warren Road and One Tree Hill Road, there is support for the proposed measures. Indeed, no objections were received. However, a number of the comments about Warren Road referred to wanting more restrictive controls. These were focused on the desire for the existing unrestricted parking bays to be subject to greater restriction and for the bays to be situated further away from driveways and other points of access.
- 2.48 In respect to Downside Road, 5 representations were supportive of the proposals. 2 of these were from residents of Downside Road. They highlighted existing parking issues close to the junction with Warren Road. Conversely, 4 representations from residents of Downside Road objected to the proposals. A number suggested that there were not any issues to address.
- 2.49 We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations. One such location is within Downside Road, close to its junction with Warren Road.
- 2.50 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Elmside (convert various existing parking bays and parts of parking bays to single yellow line, no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction)

- 2.51 We wrote directly to all 57 addresses within Elmside.
- 2.52 We received 7 representations. All were from residents of Elmside. There was 1 comment stating support for the proposals, 3 offering general support, 2 offering general opposition and 1 stating opposition. Of those offering general support 2 wanted more restrictive controls, whilst one wanted less restrictive

ITEM 10

controls. Of those generally opposed, 1 wanted more restrictive controls and 1 wanted less restrictive measures.

- 2.53 We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety, access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.
- 2.54 Some of those responding want more restrictive controls through the removal of further parking spaces. Others suggest the proposed measures to remove parking are already excessive and will lead to rat-running and increased traffic speeds.
- 2.55 The 55 properties in Elmside currently hold 5 permits. There are currently around 16 spaces in Elmside and around 12 spaces will remain if the proposals are implemented.
- 2.56 A balance has to be struck on the use of the highway in respect to parking space, safety, access and traffic flow. The modest changes aim to improve safety, access and traffic flow, whilst not unduly restricting the amount of parking space available.
- 2.57 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Epsom Road (convert two sections of existing single yellow line to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restrictions)

- 2.58 We wrote directly to 175 addresses in and around Epsom Road.
- 2.59 We received 3 representations. All were either residents of Epsom Road or the surrounding area. There were 2 comments offering general support, and 1 general opposition.
- 2.60 The 2 offering general support preferred the introduction of more restrictive controls unrelated to the proposals. Both related to Wodehouse Place, a private access road that is not public highway. Therefore, the access road is not within the remit of on-street parking review. Instead, the access is privately-owned by Guildford Borough Council, and managed by the Neighbourhood and Housing team. Therefore, the request has been forwarded onto them, for their consideration.
- 2.61 The comment generally opposed to the proposal wanted wholesale changes to the nature of the road, to allow additional parking to be introduced. Suggestions included making the road one-way, lowering the speed limit and traffic calming. Therefore, the request has been forwarded onto Surrey County Council Highways, for its consideration.

- 2.62 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Jenner Road (convert existing single yellow line outside Turret House to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction)

- 2.63 We wrote directly to 29 addresses in and around Jenner Road.
- 2.64 We received 2 representations. Both were from residents of Jenner Road. These stated support for the proposals.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford

- 2.65 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Josephs Road (convert existing limited waiting shared-use parking place outside Springside Court to permit only and introduce double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction at junction with Springside Court)

- 2.66 We wrote directly to 50 addresses in and around and around Josephs Road.
- 2.67 We received 2 representations. There was 1 comment stating support for the proposals, and 1 generally opposed. The supportive comment came from a resident of Springside Court, off Josephs Road. The representation that was generally opposed came from a resident of Stocton Road upset that their road was not also being considered as part of the review.
- 2.68 We have developed the proposals in Josephs Road in response to unsolicited safety and availability of space concerns raised prior to the start of the review. We have received very little correspondence about there being similar issues in Stocton Road, since the parking review we conducted in 2006-7. That review increased both the number of spaces available in Stocton Road and the proportion prioritised for permit-holders only.
- 2.69 Considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review. Nevertheless, if residents of Stocton Road were subsequently to submit clear evidence of support for similar changes in their road, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.
- 2.70 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Linden Road (convert existing single yellow line adjacent to the rear of No.5 Recreation Road to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction)

- 2.71 We wrote directly to 19 addresses in and around Linden Road.
- 2.72 We received 1 representation. This was from the resident directly affected by the proposal. They stated support for the proposal.
- 2.73 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Lower Edgeborough Road (convert two existing unrestricted parking places adjacent to Sheldon Court and outside Danesrood to limited waiting shared-use parking places)

- 2.74 We wrote directly to 139 addresses in and around Lower Edgeborough Road.
- 2.75 We received 15 representation. All were either residents of Lower Edgeborough Road or the surrounding area. There were 4 comments stating support for the proposals, 5 offering general support, 1 suggesting general opposition and 5 stating opposition.
- 2.76 All 5 of the representations offering general support suggested the need for even greater prioritisation for permit-holders both within Lower Edgeborough Road (Area I) and nearby Clandon Road (Area C).

ITEM 10

- 2.77 There are around 31 spaces in Lower Edgeborough Road and Sheldon Court (Area I). Currently, around 7 of these are prioritised for permit-holders. There is currently 1 permit-holder in Lower Edgeborough Road and 11 in Sheldon Court. The proposals will increase the number of prioritised spaces to 15.
- 2.78 There are around 34 spaces in Clandon Road (Area C). 20 of these spaces are currently prioritised for permit-holders. There is currently 1 permit-holder in Clandon Road.
- 2.79 The prioritised spaces are located predominantly where there is the demand for such spaces from permit-holders. Future reviews may allow us to revisit the situation if demand for permits increases.
- 2.80 Of those objecting, 1 was from Sheldon Court. The other 4 were from Telford Court, Clandon Road. The loss of flexibility, greater reliance on permits, and the increased pressure on the remaining unrestricted spaces were highlighted as reason for objection by 4 of those that commented. The lack of financial information provided was cited as the reason for objection by 1 of those commenting. The committee reports held on deposit and accessible from the Borough Council's website via links to the County Council's website outlined the financial implications associated with the review and the implementation of any changes.
- 2.81 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Mountside (convert the two existing permit only parking places in 'upper' section of the road to limited waiting shared-use parking places)

- 2.82 We wrote directly to 26 addresses in Mountside.
- 2.83 We received 4 representations. All were from residents of Mountside. There were 2 comments stating support for the proposals, 1 offering general support, and 1 stating opposition.
- 2.84 The proposal involves converting the permit only spaces on the south side of the road in the 'upper' section of the road to limited waiting shared-use. The intention is to improve the flexibility of the scheme for residents and their visitors.
- 2.85 The resident that offered general support would prefer it if the spaces at the cul-de-sac end were made permit-only, to increase their availability for permit-holders. However, the representee objecting to the change suggested that the present free availability of space meant that the proposed changes were unnecessary. Making all the spaces in the 'upper' section of Mountside limited waiting shared-use will increase flexibility and is unlikely to unduly influence the existing availability of space for permit-holders.
- 2.86 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Old Farm Road (formalised existing advisory disabled only parking place outside No.6 The Stables)

- 2.87 We wrote directly to 20 addresses in and around Old Farm Road.

2.88 We received 0 representations.

2.89 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Pewley Hill (lower) (convert existing single yellow lines outside Nos.7,9&9a to double yellow lines, no waiting at any time restrictions)

2.90 We wrote directly to 23 addresses in and around the 'lower' section of Pewley Hill.

2.91 We received 4 representations. All were from residents of Pewley Hill. All 4 comments stated support for the proposals.

2.92 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Pewley Hill (upper) (convert section of existing single yellow line outside Nos.46&50 to a limited waiting shared-use parking place)

2.93 We wrote directly to 15 addresses in the 'upper' section of Pewley Hill.

2.94 We received 3 representation. All were from residents of Pewley Hill. All 3 comments opposed the proposals on the basis that it will conflict with a proposed housing development.

2.95 The intention of the proposed parking bay was to compensate for the loss of parking associated with other recent residential developments within the road. This would assist those wishing to access the Downs for leisure purposes. It would also help those involved in the school run at the nearby Pewley Down School. However, with the prospect of developments conflicting directly with the proposal in the near future, it is recommended that the proposal is not progressed.

2.96 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees **NOT TO IMPLEMENT** the proposal.

Quarry Street (convert existing pay and display only parking place outside Nos.9-13 to a pay and display dual-use parking place)

2.97 We wrote directly to 88 addresses in and around Quarry Street.

2.98 We received 8 representation. All were residents of Quarry Street and the surrounding area. All stated support for the proposals.

2.99 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Queens Road (extend existing parking bays outside Nos.19 & 29 and [TECHNICALITY] formalised length of existing single yellow line)

2.100 We wrote directly to 54 addresses in and around Queens Road.

2.101 We received 1 representation. This was from a resident of Queens Road. They were generally supportive of the proposal to increase the availability of

space. However, they felt that additional waiting restrictions should be introduced outside Hillcrest Court to improve accessibility there.

2.102 Prior to the review, we received some correspondence about the area outside Hillcrest Court. Residents suggested that the area should become subject to controls / part of the adjacent controlled parking zone. However, having met with them on site, the residents concluded that they did not want to progress the matter. Whilst they wanted measures to prevent parking wholly within the carriageway on the bend, they wished to retain the ability to park their vehicles partially on the footway in this location. Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.

2.103 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

St Luke's Square (introduce double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction in uncontrolled section on west side between Warren Road and Cadogan House)

2.104 We wrote directly to 129 addresses in and around St Luke's Square.

2.105 We received 16 representations. All were from residents of St Luke's Square or the surrounding area. There were 7 comments stating support for the proposals and 9 offering general support. There were no representations objecting to the proposal. Of those generally supportive, all wanted more restrictive controls to be considered. This included further lengths of waiting restriction and the possibility of a residents' parking scheme.

2.106 We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review. Furthermore, during a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone. The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.

2.107 However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review. Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence of support for such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.

2.108 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

South Hill (convert existing single yellow lines outside Nos.6,8&8a to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restrictions)

2.109 We wrote directly to 21 addresses in South Hill.

2.110 We received 3 representations. All were from residents of South Hill. There were 2 comments stating support for the proposals and 1 offering general support. There were no representations objecting to the proposal.

- 2.111 In respect to the representation generally supportive of the proposals, they request that all single yellow lines in South Hill and neighbouring roads should be converted to double yellow lines. They suggest that parking in these locations cause safety and traffic flow issues.
- 2.112 We have previously introduced additional lengths of double yellow line in South Hill and Castle Street. When we introduced them in South Hill, some residents raised concerns about the loss of facility that this would cause for residents and their visitors. Clearly, introducing double yellow lines throughout the area might exacerbate these concerns. The removal of parked vehicles at less busy times, might also increase existing concerns about the speed of traffic using the road.
- 2.113 Considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review. Nevertheless, we will continue to monitor the suitability of the existing controls.
- 2.114 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Spiceall, Compton (remove existing formalised disabled only parking place outside No.36)

- 2.115 We wrote directly to 25 addresses in Spiceall.
- 2.116 We received 1 representation. This was from a resident of Spiceall. They were supportive of the proposal.
- 2.117 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Stocton Close (convert section of existing single yellow line outside Jubilee Social Club to a limited waiting shared-use parking place)

- 2.118 We wrote directly to 29 addresses in and around Stocton Close.
- 2.119 We received 0 representations.
- 2.120 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Stoke Road (convert short section of existing limited waiting shared-use parking place opposite No.133 to a double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction)

- 2.121 We wrote directly to 13 addresses in and around Stoke Road.
- 2.122 We received 0 representations.
- 2.123 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

The Oval, Wood Street Village (remove existing formalised disabled parking place outside Nos.17&19)

- 2.124 We wrote directly to 15 addresses in The Oval.
- 2.125 We received 0 representations.
- 2.126 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Tormead Road (convert two existing unrestricted parking places outside Nos.7&9 and adjacent to No.19 to limited waiting shared-use parking places)

- 2.127 We wrote directly to 69 addresses in Tormead Road.
- 2.128 We received 2 representations. Both were from residents of Tormead Road. 1 comment stated support for the proposals, whilst 1 stated opposition.
- 2.129 We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review. These suggested that certain non-permit-holding residents and residents from nearby private roads were monopolising the use of the unrestricted spaces, to the detriment of other residents and their visitors. The impending introduction of controls in nearby Duncan Drive, to resolve issues there, may exacerbate some of these issues.
- 2.130 Cllr Nelson-Smith indicated that she would prefer it if the proposals were not progressed, and the bays remained unrestricted.
- 2.131 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees **NOT TO IMPLEMENT** the proposal.

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 representations and controls recommended for implementation have been distributed to local borough and county councillors.
- 3.2 If the Committee agrees the recommendation, it is likely that the implementation will take place in early to mid-2018.
- 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 An advertisement has appeared in the Surrey Advertiser and on the public-notices.co.uk website, letters associated with the formal consultations have been distributed to over 1,200 addresses and notices put up in the roads affected. There have been around 275 'hits' on the associated pages on

Guildford Borough Council's website. Statutory consultees have also been notified.

- 4.2 The feedback and proposals detailed in Annexes 2 and 3 have been circulated to relevant local borough and county councillors.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 To undertake an appropriate level of consultation, create orders and implement changes to the signs and lines required to give affect to the proposals recommended for approval we estimate will cost no more than £12,500. This is in addition to the £11,000 the Committee has already committed to spend associated with the implementation of the proposals previously agreed at its 7 July 2017 meeting. Nevertheless, the overall cost of the review is within the £50,000 estimate that was identified at the outset of the review. If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals, the money will come from the Guildford on-street parking account.
- 5.2 Existing resources will be used to conduct the consultations and the only additional expenditure will be printing and postage. Public exhibitions were not considered necessary, but in circumstances where the need for them arises, where possible they will be held at Council facilities.

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, local residents and businesses written to directly and any comments received given careful consideration.

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

ITEM 10

- 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 It is recommended the Committee agrees that having considered the comments made during the formal period:
 - (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 as shown in Annex 3, but that the proposals in Pewley Hill (upper) and Tormead Road are not progressed at the present time.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals set out in recommendation (i), it is likely that this will take place in early to mid-2018.
- 10.2 The proposals agreed to be implemented at the Committee's July 2017 meeting are due to be introduced towards the end of 2017.
- 10.3 These timescales will ensure that the review is completed within the 18-month duration proposed at its beginning.

Contact Officer:

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

Consulted: Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

- 1 - Summary of Representations
- 2 - Representations in detail with officer comments
- 3 - Proposals to be implemented in Alresford Road, Artillery Terrace, Brodie Road, Chantry View Road, Chapel Street, Cline Road, Cross Lanes, Downside Road, Elmside, Epsom Road, Jenner Road, Josephs Road, Linden Road, Lower Edgeborough Road, Mountside, Old Farm Road, One Tree Hill Road, Pewley Hill (lower), Quarry Street, Queens Road, St Luke's Square, South Hill, Spiceall (Compton), Stocton Close, Stoke Road, The Oval (Wood Street Village), and Warren Road, but not in Pewley Hill (upper) and Tormead Road.

Sources/background papers:

- Item 9, Guildford Local Committee, 13 December 2016
- Item 9, Guildford Local Committee, 22 March 2017
- Item 10, Guildford Local Committee, 6 July 2017