



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(GUILDFORD)**

**REVIEW OF GUILDFORD TOWN CONTROLLED
PARKING ZONE
DENE ROAD AREA, ONSLOW VILLAGE
& ST LUKE'S DEVELOPMENT**

13 MARCH 2013

KEY ISSUE

This report presents the findings of further consultations with residents and businesses in three areas of the town centre, the area around Dene Road, the area beyond the existing Guildford town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ) boundary in Onslow Village and the St Luke's development and recommends proposals for new parking restrictions.

SUMMARY

Three areas of Guildford town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ), Dene Road, the area beyond the existing Guildford town CPZ boundary in Onslow Village and the St Luke's development were consulted on potential changes. All properties in the Dene Road area were sent a copy of draft proposals to change the existing parking restrictions and occupiers were asked whether they thought the measures were appropriate. In the case of Onslow Village all properties were sent a questionnaire asking whether they wished their road to be included within the CPZ. All properties in the St Luke's development were sent a copy of the draft proposal to introduce new parking restrictions in the St Luke's Square part and occupiers were asked whether they thought the measures were appropriate. We have assessed the responses and the report includes recommendations to advertise amended proposals.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Guildford Local Committee is requested to note the findings of the consultations and agree;

- (i) to formally advertise the intention to make an order to give effect to the draft proposals recently consulted upon in the Dene Road area (**Annexe 7**),
- (ii) to formally advertise the intention to make an order to give effect to the draft proposals recently consulted upon in the St Luke's development, as revised (**Annexe 8**),
- (iii) to formally advertise the intention to make an order to give effect to the draft proposals for limited controls in Onslow Village (**Annexe 9**),
- (iv) to formally advertise the intention to make an order to give effect to the changes necessary to introduce various new formalised disabled only parking places and accommodate various recently constructed vehicle crossovers (**Annexe 11**),
- (v) to formally advertise the intention to make an order to give effect to the various other changes listed in **Annexe 12**, in order to increase the availability of space, its prioritisation for various user groups, improve safety, access and traffic flow,
- (vi) to make the order if there are no unresolved objections, or if there are objections, to report these to a future meeting of Guildford Local Committee.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In the area around Dene Road, concerns have been raised about the impact that the town centre's evening and Sunday economy has on the ability of residents to park on-street. These periods currently fall outside the present hours of the controlled parking zone, which operates 8.30am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday.
- 1.2 An extension of the operational hours of the controls, whilst affording permit-holders with the prioritisation of space over an extended period, would nevertheless, increase residents' and their visitors' reliance on permits. Those residents ineligible for residents' permits, or on the waiting list would also be impacted. The period during which it would be possible to park on the single yellow lines would also be likely to reduce.
- 1.3 Last year occupiers in the Dene Road area were asked whether they wanted the operational hours of the controls in their roads to be changed to increase the prioritisation of space, and for various other changes to be made to improve access, safety and reduce congestion. A clear majority of those that responded in the Dene Road / Denmark Road / Eastgate Gardens area were supportive of such changes. Furthermore, concerns were raised about parking on the single yellow lines in Epsom Road and London Road.
- 1.4 At its meeting in June 2012 the Guildford Local Committee considered these views and agreed to develop proposals, to include London Road and Epsom Road, and consult upon them informally over the expanded area. This report present the feedback from this further consultation.
- 1.5 In the St Luke's development, concerns have been raised about the impact that uncontrolled and inconsiderate parking, in the area around St Luke's Square, has on safety, access and traffic flow, and particularly for emergency service and public service vehicles.
- 1.6 The introduction of limited controls around junctions and bends would resolve the safety, access and traffic flow issues, whilst maintaining significant amounts of parking and maximising flexibility for residents and other motorists. The introduction of a controlled parking zone would ensure that all parking is more closely regulated. It would also enable the space to be prioritised and a permit scheme to be adopted. However, in controlling all kerb-space, there would invariably be a greater loss of space, and if prioritisation measures and a permit scheme adopted, a loss of flexibility and costs incurred by residents, as they and their visitors would need to buy and display permits.
- 1.7 Last year occupiers in the St Luke's development area were asked whether they wanted their road to be subject to controls, and if so, whether they would prefer inclusion within the adjacent controlled parking zone, or more limited controls.

- 1.8 A clear split emerged between those in the 'lower' St Luke's Square section of the development, and those in the 'upper' St Luke's Park part. A clear majority in the St Luke's Square section supported the introduction of limited controls in their roads, whilst a clear majority in the St Luke's Park section of the development opposed any controls being introduced in their roads.
- 1.9 At its meeting in June 2012 the Guildford Local Committee considered these views. Officers recommended that to resolve the issues around St Luke's Square, and mitigate against the potential for displacement elsewhere within this part of the development, and the St Luke's Park section beyond, that controls be introduced around junctions and bends throughout the area. However, the Committee decided only to develop proposals for the St Luke's Square section. Nevertheless, it agreed to consult upon these with both the occupiers in St Luke's Square and St Luke's Park. This report presents the feedback from this further consultation.
- 1.10 In the area of Onslow Village beyond the existing Guildford town centre controlled parking zone boundary, concerns have been raised about the impact that uncontrolled and inconsiderate parking has on safety, access and traffic flow, and particularly for emergency service and public service vehicles.
- 1.11 The introduction of limited controls around junctions and at strategic points within the various roads in the area would resolve many of the safety, access and traffic flow issues, whilst maintaining significant amounts of parking and maximising flexibility for residents and other motorists. The introduction of a controlled parking zone would ensure that all parking is more closely regulated, particularly in relation to parking near driveways. It would also allow the space to be prioritised and a permit scheme to be adopted. However, in controlling all kerb-space, there would invariably be a greater loss of space, and if prioritisation measures and a permit scheme adopted, a loss of flexibility and costs incurred by residents, in relation to their acquisition and use of residents' and visitor permits.
- 1.12 Last year occupiers in the Onslow Village area were asked whether they wanted their road to be subject to controls, and if so, whether they would prefer inclusion within the adjacent controlled parking zone, or more limited controls. Although a clear majority of those in several of the roads thought their road should be subject to controls, there was less certainty as to the nature of the controls that should be adopted.
- 1.13 At its meeting in June 2012 the Guildford Local Committee considered these views and agreed to undertake further consultation upon on a more simple, yes / no option to inclusion within the adjacent controlled parking zone. This report presents the feedback from this further consultation.
- 1.14 Prior to, and since the commencement of the current parking review, a number of requests have been received, via the County Council, to introduce new, or formalise existing, disabled only parking bays, which are provided to accommodate the parking needs of specific households in

residential areas. Similarly, there has been a number of vehicle crossovers constructed, which conflict with formalised parking bays. The intention is to make the necessary amendments to the controls in order to facilitate these, as part of the current review.

- 1.15 In addition to the major elements of the current review, there are various other relatively minor issues, that it may be possible to address through changes to one or a small number of the existing controls in a particular locality. These are primarily being considered in order to increase the availability of space, its prioritisation for various user groups, improve safety, access and traffic flow. Others being considered are technical changes to ensure that the traffic regulation order matches the controls in-situ.

2. Analysis

Road	No. of Properties	No of Responses	Response rate	Support draft proposals	Support controls but preferring changes	Opposed to draft proposals
Dene Road	52	9	17%	3	6	0
Denmark Road	3	0	0%	0	0	0
Eastgate Gardens	40	3	8%	2	0	1
Eastgate House	33	0	0%	0	0	0
Epsom Road (part)	189	7	4%	4	1	2
London Road (part)	98	4	4%	1	2	1
York Road (part)	122	2	2%	0	1	1
Other	n/a	1	n/a	0	0	1
Overall	538	26	5%	10	10	6

Dene Road Area Summary of result from the consultation

- 2.1 A summary of the individual comments received is presented in **Annexe 4**.
- 2.2 The initial consultation questionnaire established that there was a clear desire amongst those that responded for changes to the operational hours of the controls and various other amendments. That consultation had a 17% response rate overall, although in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens, the response rates were 46%, 44% and 28%, respectively.
- 2.3 The latest consultation, which focused on the actual detail of the possible changes, rather than the principle, resulted in a 5% response rate.
- 2.4 Of the 26 comments received about the detail of the proposals, 20 of them either support the proposed changes (10), or support controls but with

amendments to those proposed (10). 6 opposed the changes. Of those that support controls but with amendments to those proposed, 3 want more restrictive controls to be considered, whilst 7 want less restrictive controls introduced.

- 2.5 Of those that want more restrictive controls, one wants the permit scheme to operate at all times. Another wants some of the single yellow lines in Dene Road, which it is proposed will operate 8.30am-9pm, rather than the present Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm, to become double yellow lines, operating at all times. Another wants the accesses serving the commercial properties in London Road and Epsom Road to be double yellow lines to improve access
- 2.6 Conversely, many of those that prefer to see less restrictive controls introduced, and parking on the single yellow lines retained in the evenings and on Sundays, cited the present flexibility and additional facility provided by being able to park upon the single yellow lines at these times.
- 2.7 Additionally, a number of those that commented want changes to be made to the permit scheme, as a result of the extended operational hours increasing residents' reliance on permits.
- 2.8 At present a maximum of 273 area D residents' permits are in use at any one time, with those on the waiting list, or with the need for a second permit, being issued with permits for an adjacent area. Like other areas within the controlled parking zone, households can acquire up to 30 visitor scratch-card permits per annum.
- 2.9 Those suggesting changes to the permit scheme want residents' permits to become more readily available. There is also a desire for the visitor scratch-card permits allocation to be increased, and permits offered at a discounted cost. Some want further dispensations to allow them park in the Borough Council's car parks. Area D permit holders are already afforded free use of the pay and display car parks overnight.
- 2.10 To help offset the loss of facility caused by the extension of the operational hours of the single yellow lines, and conversion of some of them to double yellow lines, a number of additional permit only spaces are proposed in Dene Road. Furthermore, it is proposed that the existing permit only and shared-use pay and display spaces will be prioritised for permit-holders until 9pm. There are around 73 spaces and 77 permit-holders in this part of Area D, and around 664 spaces and 273 permit-holders in Area D as a whole.
- 2.11 Whilst, in theory, the single yellow lines being retained in Dene Road and Eastgate Gardens could continue to operate 8.30am-6pm Monday-Saturday, this would result in a situation where the parking bays operate over one period and the single yellow lines, over another. This has the potential for increasing confusion among motorists wishing to park. They may be more likely to be used to the single yellow lines and adjacent parking bays operating over the same period, as is the case throughout the remainder of the town centre controlled parking zone. It would also result in

a situation, where it would be possible to park in locations where it was not considered suitable for a parking bays to be positioned, due to traffic during the Monday-Saturday daytime period, at times when the traffic associated with the evening and Sunday economy was still significant.

2.12 To highlight the fact that the parking arrangements within the Dene Road / Denmark Road / Eastgate Gardens area are different from the surrounding area, it is recommended that additional controlled zone signs with the revised hours be introduced at the various entry points. Although the operational hours which appear on such zone entry signs primarily relate to the operational hours of the single yellow lines beyond, such signs are considered appropriate in this case to draw the attention of motorists entering the Dene Road / Denmark Road / Eastgate Gardens area to the different circumstances. This means drivers would not have to rely solely on the signs appertaining to the parking bays. To sign the restrictions in this way would mean the single yellow lines could not operate 8.30am-6pm but would have to apply for the extended period 8.30am-9.00pm Monday to Sunday.

2.13 Similar concerns are also raised about the loss of facility resulting from the conversion of the large portions of the single yellow lines in London and Epsom Roads into double yellow lines. However, the impact that parking on the single yellow lines, outside their present operational hours, has on the free and safe movement of traffic into and out of the area, on two of the main routes within the area, is such that the loss of facility is a secondary consideration.

2.14 In conclusion, some respondents wanted more controls and other wanted less or none. On balance, it is recommended that the draft proposals that have been informally consulted upon be formally advertised (see **Annexe 7**). It may be possible to reconsider permit eligibility issues during a future parking review.

Controls in St Luke's Square			Summary result from the consultation			
Road	No. of Properties	No of Responses	Response rate	Support draft proposals	Support controls but preferring changes	Opposed to draft proposals
St Batholome w's Court	11	7	64%	4	3	0
St Catherine's Park	15	3	20%	0	2	1
St Luke's Square	91	18	20%	10	8	0
St Thomas's Mews	8	4	50%	3	1	0
Sub-total for 'Lower' (St	125	32	26%	17	14	1

Luke's Square) part						
Lancaster Avenue	52	13	25%	0	8	5
Newlands Crescent	12	1	8%	1	0	0
Sells Close	40	7	8%	0	4	3
Sub-total for 'Upper' (St Luke's Park) part	104	21	20%	1	12	8
Residents' Assocs & Managemen t Cos	3	2	67%	0	1	1
Unknown Adresses	n/a	3	n/a	0	1	2
Overall	232	58	25%	18	28	12

2.15 A summary of the individual comments received is presented in **Annexe 5**.

2.16 The initial consultation questionnaire established that there was a clear desire amongst those that responded in the St Luke's Square part of the development for the introduction of limited parking controls in their roads. Conversely, those in the St Luke's Park section of the development opposed controls being considered in their roads. That consultation had a 49% response rate.

2.17 The latest consultation, which focused on the actual detail of the possible measures being considered within the St Luke's Square part of the development, rather than the principle, resulted in a 25% response rate.

2.18 Within the St Luke's Square area directly affected by the proposed controls, 31 of the 32 responses either support the controls as proposed (17), or support having controls but would like to see amendments (14). Of the 14 supporting controls with amendments, 7 would prefer to see more restrictive controls, by way of more yellow lines, or restrictions on the areas where parking will still be permitted but with exemptions for residents. The 7 wanting less restrictive controls, tend to want the yellow lines to be less extensive and operating over a limited period, rather than at any time, to provide more flexibility for residents and their visitors. Parking on the 90-degree bend is the primary concern raised by most respondents. There are also concerns about parking within close proximity, opposite, and on the bellmouths of various other junctions within the St Luke's Square, which pose difficulties for access by small and large vehicles alike.

2.19 Of the residents within the St Luke's Park area who commented on the proposed controls in St Lukes Square , 13 of the 21 responses either support the idea of controls but would like to see amendments to the proposal (12), or support the controls as proposed (1). Of the 12 supporting

the introduction of controls with amendments, 4 would like yellow line waiting restrictions within the St Luke's Park part of the development. These residents want this in order to deal with existing issues there, and to mitigate against potential problems arising from the introduction of controls in the St Luke's Square section. The 8 wanting less restrictive controls in St Lukes Square, tend to want the yellow lines to be less extensive and operating over a limited period, to minimise the potential for parking to displace into St Luke's Park. Of those who opposed the proposals in St Luke's Square (8), one did so on the basis that they had no desire to see controls introduced in St Luke's Park, whilst others expressed the view that the issues in St Luke's Square were relatively minor in nature, and the proposed controls were excessive and would lead to unnecessary displacement.

2.20 The St Luke's Park Residents' Association, which represents the views of the 'upper' part of the development, object to the proposals in the St Luke's Square section of the development on the basis that they are grossly excessive. Furthermore, they suggest that engineering solutions should be considered to increase the availability of parking in the St Luke's Square part of the development, as well as the possibility of one-way flow around the square, to remove the need to maintain two-way flow.

2.21 The St Luke's Residents' Association represents the views of the 'lower' part of the development. Whilst it sympathises with the desire of some residents for there to be more single yellow lines, to facilitate parking in the evening and weekends, and would prefer to see controls within the parking areas to restrict long-stay parking by non-residents, the residents' association nevertheless endorses the proposals.

2.22 The St Luke's Management Company, which represents the property-owners in St Luke's Square, supports the proposals, although they would like to see more extensive controls, with both sides of the carriageway leading from Warren Road being protected by double yellow lines.

2.23 The vast majority of the proposed controls around the junctions and bends in the St Luke's Square area extend the 10-metre minimum within which parking should not take place. Only the 90-degree bend has more extensive controls on both sides of the carriageway, concerns having been raised about parking on both sides of the road and footway in this area, and upon the access road to the parking facilities at the rear of the flats. Although the primary concern is about the 90-degree bend, and something which even those opposed to the proposals accept is an issue (to some extent), concerns about parking around the various other junctions have been raised during the various consultations. Therefore, if controls were only introduced around the 90-degree bend, there is an increased likelihood that the existing issues around the various other points within the St Luke's Square area would be exacerbated, if controls were not also considered in those locations.

2.24 Whilst vehicles parked by non-residents may be the cause the vast majority of inconsiderate parking activity that takes place within St Luke's Square, if residents or their visitors were to park within 10 metres of

junctions and bends, they would tend to cause the same issues, particularly for public service and emergency service vehicles. Therefore, for the junction and bend protection measures being considered, double yellow lines are more appropriate than single yellow lines, operating over a shorter period.

2.25 Nevertheless, there is perhaps scope to revise / lessen some of the controls away from junctions and bends, without unduly reducing the effectiveness of the measures. The revised proposals are shown in **Annexe 8**.

2.26 This may go some way to reduce the potential for parking to displace into the St Luke's Park part of the development. The Committee previously decided not to develop proposals for the St Luke's Park section of the development, having given consideration to the views expressed by residents.

Onslow Village Area Summary of result from the consultation and comparison with previous consultation

Road	No. of Properties	No of Responses	Response rate	Support inclusion within CPZ	Support introduction of controls (previous consultation)
Abbotts Close	30	12	40%	33%	34%
Farnham Road, (Abbotts Close)	13	7	54%	71%	60%
Bannisters Road	26	16	65%	59%	71%
Ellis Avenue	21	16	76%	81%	94%
Guildford-Godalming Bypass	5	0	0%	0%	0%
Highview Road	106	41	39%	15%	36%
Litchfield Way(part)	26	13	50%	35%	35%
Manor Way	77	39	51%	28%	31%
Orchard Road	21	13	62%	62%	50%
Powell Close	25	12	48%	25%	43%
The Crossways (part)	7	7	100%	71%	85%
Vicarage Gate	18	10	56%	10%	36%
West Meads (part)	4	3	75%	100%	100%
Wilderness Road	74	29	39%	55%	68%
Farm Walk, (Wilderness Road)	12	7	58%	29%	51%
The Square, (Wilderness Road)	16	6	38%	0%	28%
Windsor Close	20	5	25%	0%	17%
Overall	501	237	47%	39%	49%
Within area of possible CPZ	293	155	53%	45%	57%

2.27 A more detailed breakdown of the feedback is presented in **Annexe 6**.

- 2.28 The initial consultation questionnaire established that there was a clear desire (>60%) amongst those that responded in 6 roads, including Wilderness Road, for the introduction of controls to resolve the parking issues experienced / observed. However, it was less clear what the nature of the controls employed should be (limited controls, or a controlled parking zone). Nevertheless, in a number of these roads, there appeared to be a desire for the controlled parking zone to be extended to include their roads. As a result, the Committee agreed to undertake further consultation on the possible westward extension of the controlled parking zone, but this time asking a simple yes/no question.
- 2.29 The latest consultation resulted in a 47% response rate, broadly similar to the original response rate. Overall, within the tentatively proposed controlled parking zone extension, 45% of respondents support inclusion within the zone. This compares to 57% support when the possibility of more limited controls was being offered. However, within this area, 4 of the 13 roads (Ellis Avenue, Orchard Road, The Crossways [part] and West Meads [part]) clearly support inclusion. In 2 of the 13 roads views are mixed (Bannisters Road & Wilderness Road). The remaining 7 roads are less supportive of inclusion within the proposed zone.
- 2.30 However, within the roads that clearly support inclusion within the controlled zone, those that provide additional comments primarily cite safety and access as the reason for the need for the extension to the zone. Indeed, only in The Crossways were the issues caused by non-residents on the availability of parking space for residents and their visitors raised.
- 2.31 Given the nature of the issues highlighted, and the relatively small number of roads clearly supportive of inclusion within the controlled parking zone, officers recommend that limited controls are considered around various junctions, bends and at strategic points within various roads within the area beyond the present controlled parking zone boundary (see **Annexe 9**). This would assist in resolving the issues raised, whilst maintaining the flexible use of space for all user-groups and minimising the potential for displacement into roads that are, in general, less supportive of controls.
- 2.32 However, the local ward and divisional councillors that represent the area are keen for those roads that are clearly supportive of inclusion within the controlled parking zone, and perhaps some of those adjacent that are not, to be included within an extension to the zone.
- 2.33 Although the adoption of controlled parking zone measures would regulate parking within the area more extensively, it would reduce the overall availability of space more significantly, and thereby increase the likelihood of displacement into the adjacent uncontrolled area. It would also reduce flexibility for residents and their visitors and cause them to incur additional costs, in locations, which although clearly supportive of inclusion within the zone, have expressed few concerns about the availability of on-street parking for residents and their visitors.

- 2.34 Recent extensions to the controlled parking zone have generally involved in excess of a dozen roads. Although some of the roads within these areas may have not supported inclusion within the zone, overall there has generally been a high initial level of support (65-70%). Nevertheless, when the detailed proposals are subsequently developed, there can often be considerable resistance to them, even in locations that initially expressed high levels of support.
- 2.35 In the case of Onslow Village, within the proposed extension area, only 45% support inclusion within the CPZ. Even in a more limited extension area encompassing only the roads clearly supportive of inclusion and those adjacent, there is only 50% support for inclusion within the CPZ. However, within the same area, 62% expressed support for controls when originally consulted.
- 2.36 It would be feasible to extend the controlled parking zone by a single road, or the small number of roads clearly supportive of inclusion. However, if only 4 hour limited waiting share-use spaces are to be provided, this would result in those non-residents that park for longer periods being displaced into the adjacent area. In many cases, these areas may already be more heavily parked, and less supportive of parking controls.
- 2.37 Nevertheless, at the request of the local ward and divisional councillors, alternative proposals for the extension of the controlled parking zones have been developed, in addition to those recommended by the officers. These appear in **Annexe 10**. Please note however, that proposals have been developed for the entire area tentatively being considered for inclusion within the controlled parking zone.
- 2.38 We are recommending that the controls presented in **Annexe 9** of this report be advertised with the intention of implementing them. However if the Committee wanted to go forward with a possible extension to the CPZ in Onslow Village, then **Annexe 10** provides proposal to consult on. If the Committee decides to take this route, it is suggested that they specify which roads they would like included. It is also suggested that a further round of consultation on the specific proposals is undertaken, using public exhibitions and other forms of communication, so that those affected have the opportunity to comment on the detail. The results of this consultation would be reported back to a further Committee meeting before the scheme is advertised.

Other Changes

- 2.39 Prior to, and since the commencement of the current parking review, a number of requests have been received, via the County Council, to introduce new disabled only parking bays, which are provided to accommodate the parking needs of specific households in residential areas. Similarly, there has been a number of vehicle crossovers constructed, which conflict with formalised parking bays. The intention is to make the necessary amendments to the controls in order to facilitate these, as part of the current review. The locations involved are listed in **Annexe 11**.

2.40 In addition to the major elements of the current review, there are various other more minor issues, that it may be possible to address through changes to one, or a small number of the existing controls in a particular locality. These are primarily being considered in order to increase the availability of space, its prioritisation for various user-groups, improve safety, access and traffic flow. Others being considered are technical changes to ensure that the traffic regulation order matches the controls in-situ. The locations involved and proposed change(s) are listed in **Annexe 12**.

3. CONSULTATIONS

3.1 On 12 October 2012, 501 letters and questionnaires were distributed to all properties in the Onslow Village consultation area (see **Annexe 3**). On 14 December 2012, 538 letters detailing the draft proposals for the area around Dene Road were sent to all properties in the area (see **Annexe 1**). On the same date, 232 letters detailing the draft proposals for the area around St Luke's Square were sent to all properties in the area (see **Annexe 2**). The three letters explained the advantages and disadvantages of the potential changes.

4. HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Aside from the increase in enforcement resources associated with the decriminalisation of parking within Guildford Borough, and the assumption of the on-street enforcement role in Waverley Borough, Parking Services has not increased its on-street enforcement resources since the acquisition of an additional staff member during the last extension of the controlled parking zone into Onslow Village in 2003.

4.2 In the intervening period, around 25 kilometres of additional controls have been introduced within Guildford Borough. Additionally, changes to the legislation mean that the range of contraventions that the enforcement officers can act upon has also expanded.

4.3 Therefore, consideration will be given to the level of resources available and to ensure there is no 'dilution' of the enforcement effort. It will only be possible to gauge this reliably once the new controls are operational.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The cost of the review and any subsequent implementation works will be met by the on-street parking account, controlled by the Committee. This is not anticipated to be more than £50,000. There are no other value for money implications coming from the recommendations.

6. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no sustainable development implications.

7. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

8. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The introduction of new, and formalisation of existing, disabled only parking places, provided for particular households in residential areas, will assist those with mobility issues, that are more reliant on the private car and the need for it to be conveniently situated in relation to their property. There are no other equality and diversity implications.

9. CONCLUSION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 The introduction of changes to the parking controls in the Dene Road area will increase the prioritisation of space for permit-holders over an extended period and assist in resolving various safety, access and traffic flow issues in the vicinity.

9.2 The introduction of new parking controls in the St Luke's Square area will assist in resolving various safety, access and traffic flow issues in the vicinity.

9.3 The introduction of new limited parking controls in Onslow Village will assist in resolving various safety, access and traffic flow issues in the vicinity.

9.4 The introduction of new disabled only parking places for specific households in residential areas, will assist with their mobility requirements.

9.5 The introduction of changes to the parking controls to accommodate various recently created vehicle crossovers and accesses to new developments, will assist in providing the right of access onto the public highway.

9.6 The introduction of various other changes to the parking controls within the town centre controlled parking zone will increase the amount of space available, its prioritisation for permit-holders and assist in resolving various safety, access and traffic flow issues in the vicinity.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

9.1 These consultations are part of a programme of works which make up the current review of the controlled parking zone. :

- (i) Advertising a proposal for changes to the parking controls in the Dene Road area.

- (ii) Advertising a proposal for new parking controls in the St Luke's Square.
 - (iii) Advertising a proposal for new limited parking controls in Onslow Village, or further informal consultation about the possibility of an extension to the controlled parking zone, including exhibitions.
 - (iv) Advertising a proposal for disabled only parking spaces.
 - (v) Advertising a proposal for changes to various existing parking controls to accommodate new vehicle crossovers and accesses to developments.
 - (vi) Advertising a proposal for changes to various existing parking controls within the controlled parking zone.
- Furthermore, work will continue with the other elements which include
- (vii) Advertising a proposal for changes to the bays in Cranley Road.
 - (viii) Advertising a proposal for introducing restrictions in Rivermount Gardens.

LEAD OFFICER: David Curl
Parking Strategy and Implementation Team
Manager

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 03456 009009

E-MAIL: kevin.mckee@guildford.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER: Kevin McKee /Andrew Harkin

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 01483 444530
01483 444535

E-MAIL: andrew.harkin@guildford.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Item 6, 22 September 2011 Guildford Local
Committee, Minute 27/12
Item 9, 13 June 2012 Guildford Local
Committee, Minute 9/12

Version No. 3 Date:25/2/13 Time:14:50 Initials:APH No of annexes 12

This page is intentionally left blank