

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

DATE: WEDNESDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2013
 LEAD OFFICER: DAVID CURL, PARKING STRATEGY & IMPLEMENTATION
 TEAM MANAGER



SUBJECT: REVIEW OF GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED
 PARKING ZONE – DENE ROAD AREA, RIVERMOUNT
 GARDENS, ST LUKE’S SQUARE and OTHER AREAS

DIVISIONS: GUILDFORD SOUTH EAST
 GUILDFORD SOUTH WEST
 GUILDFORD NORTH
 HORSLEYS

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report presents representations and objections received because of advertising proposed changes to existing parking restrictions and the introduction of new parking at various locations mainly in the town centre but also at other locations. This report makes recommendations as to the next steps.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree that:

- (i) in respect to the area around Cranley Road schools, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to the parking restrictions set out in Annexe 1 but with minor amendments which lessen the proposed level of control. The minor amendments would be to increase the amount of 4 hour limited waiting shared use parking in Hillier Road and not to create a parking bay outside 60/62 Tormead Road (paragraphs 2.7 & 2.8) as shown in Annexe 7
- (ii) in respect to the Dene Road Area, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to parking restrictions set out in Annexe 2, so that the controls can be implemented
- (iii) in respect to Rivermount Gardens, the traffic regulation order is made as advertised and shown in Annexe 3, so that the controls can be implemented and the road becomes part of Area G of the Guildford town centre Controlled Parking Zone
- (iv) in respect to St Luke’s Square, the traffic regulation order is made as advertised and shown in Annexe 4, so that the controls can be implemented
- (v) in respect to the other changes shown in Annexe 5, it makes the traffic regulation order as previously advertised, with minor amendments, so that the controls can be implemented. The minor amendments being the deletion of the proposed disabled bay in Cline Road (2.33) and the adjustment of

ITEM 7

parking around the access to No. 7 Josephs Road (2.35)

- (vi) the agreed controls are implemented and the implementation funded from the on-street account

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Implementation of the recommendations will assist with safety, access and traffic movements in the area and make local improvements. These improvements include accommodating new vehicle crossovers, increasing the availability of space and its prioritisation for permit-holders, the creation of formal disabled bays both for residents near their homes, and at specific destinations, and to correct minor discrepancies so that the traffic regulation order matches the markings on the street.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Within the Guildford town centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), various 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, at times when the present controls do not operate. Within the CPZ concerns have also been raised about the availability of parking for various user-groups, predominantly residents and their visitors.
- 1.2 Similarly, just beyond the existing CPZ boundary various 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, in locations where there are presently no controls.

Cranley Road schools

- 1.3 When the roads around Lanesborough and Tormead schools first became part of the CPZ in 2006, a combination of 4-hour limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays were introduced. Limited waiting shared use spaces allow vehicles displaying a valid permit to park without time limit but restrict vehicles not displaying a permit to a maximum period of parking.
- 1.4 Generally, the limited waiting bays were located centrally within each road, to make them more convenient to residents and their visitors. However, some suggested that the parking bays closest to the schools should be tailored specifically to accommodate the demands of the school run, and have short limited waiting periods. This was not implemented on the basis that providing for the school run in this way would not be the most efficient use of kerb space and displace longer stay parking activity elsewhere.
- 1.5 Furthermore, significantly increasing the availability of space might actually encourage more parents to drive their children to school. Additionally, if these spaces are concentrated in close proximity to the school it may actually increase the volume of traffic in the immediate area, rather than parents parking a few minutes away and walking the last part of their journey.

- 1.6 The limited waiting shared use spaces were more widely available and the unrestricted spaces often filled with cars. During a parking review in 2009, the parking bays in Cranley Road were rearranged so that all those in the immediate vicinity of the schools were 4-hour limited waiting shared use spaces. However, the overall proportion of time limited shared use and unrestricted space was maintained across the area.
- 1.7 As the changes were being implemented Lanesborough School organised a petition seeking a reorganisation of the parking bays near their school, and a reduction in the limited waiting period. The 125-signature petition came from residents of the area, teachers and parents. The Committee agreed to revisit the situation during the next CPZ review.
- 1.8 At the start of the current CPZ review, at its meeting in September 2011, the Committee agreed to advertise formal proposals to rearrange the parking around the schools. The proposal planned to swap some of the unrestricted spaces closest to the schools with limited waiting shared-use bays. It was also proposed to reduce the limited waiting period in the spaces closest to the schools from 4 hours to 2 hours. Nevertheless, under the proposal the overall proportion of unrestricted and time limited spaces would broadly remain the same (see [Annexe 1](#))
- 1.9 The proposal was formally advertised during July and August 2013. The schools and Pit Farm Tennis Club were notified of the consultation directly. This report presents the resultant representations and recommends the next steps.

Dene Road area

- 1.10 During the 2006 CPZ review the number of parking spaces on-street in Dene Road was increased from 24 to 34. All the additional spaces provided were permit only, their number increasing from 8 to 18. During that review residents in area D of the town centre were asked about various aspects of the scheme including issues surrounding permit eligibility and whether they would like to see a change in the control hours. No such desire was expressed.
- 1.11 However, during the 2009 CPZ review residents across Area D were consulted about the possibility of the controls and prioritisation measures operating on Sundays. Dene Road was one of the few roads clearly to support such a move. However, because of the lack of wider support across the area, the proposal for Sunday controls was not progressed.
- 1.12 Prior to the start of the present review a petition was received from 52 households in and around Dene Road concerned about parking in the evenings and on Sundays. An extension of the restrictions to include Sundays and for the controls to operate on all day to 9pm, was suggested.
- 1.13 At its meeting in September 2011, the Committee agreed to undertake informal consultation about possible changes to the operational hours. In March 2012 around 350 occupiers within the area were sent a questionnaire survey. Those that responded from Dene Road and Eastgate Gardens expressed clear support for the changes, both in terms of evening controls and in terms of the controls operating on Sundays.

ITEM 7

- 1.14 Some respondents also raised concerns about problems caused by parking on the single yellow lines in London Road and Epsom Road. At around the same time Surrey Police also raised similar concerns. Following discussions with local ward and divisional councillors proposals were developed encompassing Dene Road, Denmark Road, Eastgate Gardens, Epsom Road and London Road.
- 1.15 At its meeting in June 2012, the Committee agreed to undertake a further stage of informal consultation, about the specific proposals. In October 2012, around 550 occupiers over an extended area, including Epsom Road, were sent the proposals and asked to comment upon them. 77 per cent of respondents supported the proposals, 42 per cent fully and 35 per cent with amendments. Of those that were supportive but with amendments, 44 per cent wanted more restrictive controls while 56 per cent wanted less restrictive controls.
- 1.16 At its meeting in March 2013, the Committee agreed to formally advertise the proposals previously consulted upon informally (see [Annexe 2](#)). The proposals were formally advertised during July and August 2013. Again, those in and around the area were written to directly. This report presents the resultant representations and recommends the next steps.

Rivermount Gardens

- 1.17 Rivermount Gardens is currently situated outside the CPZ, albeit that it can only be accessed via Portsmouth Road, which is located within Area G of the CPZ. Shortly before the start of the present parking review concerns were raised about the parking situation in Rivermount Gardens and the impact this has on safety, access and traffic flow. Uninterrupted lengths of parking, parking close to junctions, bends and around the crest of the hill effectively causes potential safety and traffic flow issues and reduces the road to single-lane. The parking is predominantly by non-residents seeking access to the town.
- 1.18 At its meeting in September 2011, the Committee agreed to investigate the matter, and if necessary, undertake informal consultation with the 19 households within the road. The latter took place in December 2011. A clear majority of respondents wanted their road to be included within the adjacent CPZ, in this case Area G.
- 1.19 At its meeting in June 2012, the Committee agreed to advertise formally a proposal to introduce controls and include Rivermount Gardens within the CPZ (see [Annexe 3](#)). The proposals were formally advertised during July and August 2013. Households within Rivermount Gardens were written to directly. This report presents the resultant representations and recommends the next steps.

St Luke's Square

- 1.20 St Luke's Square is bound on three sides by Area C of the CPZ and is accessed via a section of Warren Road which form part of Area C. In the last few years, concerns have been raised about the impact that inconsiderate parking, primarily by non-residents, has on safety, access and flow, particularly for larger delivery vehicles, emergency service and other public service vehicles. Prior to the present review commencing a resident from St

Lukes Square presented a summary of a petition from 24 households, which indicated over 90% wanted some form of parking control. The 24 households represent about 20% of the total households within this section of the development. However, others suggested that this might be a minority opinion.

- 1.21 At its meeting in September 2011 St Lukes Square was included as one of the areas to be considered as part of this review and it was suggested that the St Lukes Park part of the development around Lancaster Avenue also be considered.
- 1.22 The initial consultation took place in April 2012 and involved around 250 households and other interested parties such as the residents' groups and management company. A marked split in opinion emerged between those households in the St Luke's Square section of the development and those in the St Luke's Park section. Those in St Luke's Square expressed a clear desire for controls in their section of the development, whilst those in St Luke's Park generally preferred for there to be no controls. The feedback was presented to the Committee.
- 1.23 At its meeting in June 2012 the Committee agreed to develop proposals for St Luke's Square in consultation with local residents, local ward and divisional members, and such views will be fully taken into account when considered at a future Local Committee. Whilst considering there was likely to be some displacement parking in St Lukes Park (Lancaster Avenue, Newlands Crescent and Sells Close) if parking controls were introduced in St Luke's Square, the Committee noted the wishes of the residents not to have any controls and resolved not to develop proposals for St Luke's Park.
- 1.24 The proposals subsequently developed were consulted upon in January 2013. Again households and other interested parties were written to directly. Within St Luke's Square, the area directly affected by the proposals, there was almost unanimous support for having controls parking controls from those who responded. However, of those who were supportive, just under a half thought that there should be changes to the specifics of the proposals. Of this half, around half thought the proposals did not go far enough, whilst the other half thought the proposals presented too much restriction.
- 1.25 Those who responded from St Luke's Park generally wanted less extensive controls, primarily to minimise the potential for displacement into their section of the development.
- 1.26 The feedback was presented to the Committee. At its meeting in March 2013 the Committee agreed to advertise formally proposals for St Luke's Square. However, the proposals to be advertised were amended slightly from those consulted upon previously. In a couple of locations additional lengths of control were proposed, whilst in others controls were removed (see [Annexe 4](#)). The proposals were formally advertised during July and August 2013. Again, households and other interested parties were written to directly. This report presents the resultant representations and recommends the next steps.

Other Changes

- 1.27 In addition to the main geographic elements of the review (Cranley Road, Dene Road area, Onslow Village, Rivermount Gardens and St Luke's Square), a great many requests for 'one off' changes had been received both prior to and during the course of the review. These primarily related to safety, access, traffic flow and the availability and prioritisation of parking space. In other locations, development work meant that a need had arisen to alter the controls to reflect any changes to the access arrangements. In some cases, this meant that opportunities to create additional spaces arose. There was also a need to accommodate recently created / extended vehicle crossovers and requests to introduce disabled spaces close to specific residential properties.
- 1.28 At its meeting in March 2013 the Committee agreed to advertise formally changes in around 40 locations (see Annexe 5). The proposals were formally advertised during July and August 2013. This report presents the resultant representations and recommends the next steps.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The representations received because of the formal advertisement of the various proposals appear in Annexes 6.1-6.5.

Cranley Road Schools

- 2.2 The representations associated with the proposals to rearrange the parking so that many the spaces in the immediate vicinity of the schools are 2-hour limited waiting shared-use, as opposed to unrestricted and 4-hour limited waiting shared-use appear in Annexe 6.1.
- 2.3 In total 36 representations were received, including a 123-signature petition. Of these, 35 raised concerns about the impact of the proposed changes. 32 of the 36 representations, including the petition, were received from Pit Farm Tennis Club and its members. Their concerns primarily relate to the proposals in Hillier Road.
- 2.4 The tennis club and its member suggest that they are heavily reliant on the availability of the 4-hour limited waiting parking spaces both within Hillier Road, and in some of the nearby roads. They suggest in particular that the 2-hour parking bay being proposed in Hillier Road, at the expense of a similarly sized 4-hour parking bay, will be of no use to members of the tennis club, and will therefore have an adverse effect on its operation. They recommend no change in Hillier Road, or an increase in the number of 4-hour limited waiting spaces within the road.
- 2.5 Four other representations were received about the proposals from local residents, one of which was in favour, the other three opposed. The representation in favour thought that the changes would promote the use of spaces which are presently not utilised. The other representations were opposed to the proposals for a variety of reasons. Two specifically objected to the change of the limited waiting bay outside and opposite their property to unrestricted, and the impact that this would have for themselves, their visitors and others. The other representation suggested that the reduction of the

limited waiting period from 4 to 2 hours in a number of the spaces would reduce the flexibility of the scheme for local residents and their visitors and that the schools should resolve the issues they have created.

- 2.6 Within the immediate area around Cranley Road, there are 195 4-hour limited waiting shared-use spaces and 184 unrestricted spaces. The proposals advertised would change this to 62 2-hour limited waiting shared-use spaces, 134 4-hour limited waiting shared-use spaces and 186 unrestricted spaces. Within these roads there are presently 35 permit holders. There are no plans to change most convenient parking bay immediately adjacent to the Tennis Club and this will remain 4-hour limited waiting shared-use.
- 2.7 Officers circulated the representations to the local ward and divisional councillors. Following discussion it is recommended the proposals are implemented but with amendments to the proposed arrangements in Hillier Road. The parking place in Hillier Road nearest to the junction with Cranley Road is made less restrictive than proposed with a limited waiting period of 4 hours rather than 2 hours and that the parking place outside No.10 and 12 Hillier Road are kept at 4 hours limited. This will result in there being to 56 2-hour limited waiting shared-use spaces, 145 4-hour limited waiting shared-use spaces and 181 unrestricted spaces in the vicinity.
- 2.8 It is also recommended not to progress with the proposed introduction of a parking place outside No. 60/62 Tormead Road because of its close proximity to the bend. However, it is still recommended to remove the bay opposite No.63/65 to improve access.

Dene Road Area

- 2.9 The representations associated with the above appear in [Annexe 6.2](#). The proposals would extend the operational hours of the restrictions associated with the parking bays and single yellow lines in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens. The proposals also make various other changes to the controls both within these roads, Epsom Road and London Road
- 2.10 In total 10 representations were received. Of these, six were broadly supportive of the need for the amendments. However, all wanted specific changes to be made to the proposals, and some wanted the way in which the permit scheme operates altered.
- 2.11 In relation to the proposals themselves, it was suggested that; all the spaces be permit only after 6pm, that some of the single yellow lines that are proposed to be converted to double yellow lines be retained as single yellow lines, that the operational hours of the single yellow lines should remain Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm, and that after 6pm the single yellow lines should become parking bays prioritised for permit-holders. One person wanted the eastern extents of the existing parking bay in Epsom Road to be revised to improve visibility when using the access.
- 2.12 The amendments suggested to the permit scheme include changing permit eligibility so that residents can acquire Area D permits more quickly. There is currently a restriction on the maximum number of residents' permits issued at any one time, and a waiting list. Progress to the top of the waiting list is dependent on current residents' permits being relinquished by other households. A similar relaxation is requested for the number of visitor

ITEM 7

permits that residents can acquire. This is currently limited to 30 per annum. The need for the changes to be effectively enforced was also raised.

- 2.13 One of the four representees that opposed the proposals suggested that there was no need for charging on Sundays, albeit that there are no plans to charge to use the pay and display spaces they then referred to, in London Road, on Sundays. Others objected on the basis that those living in bedsits, who can only acquire two permits for the entire property, regardless of how many residents it accommodates, and those on the waiting list would be unduly affected by the extension of the controls hours if they and their visitors were unable to acquire the relevant permits. An objection has also been raised by a member of the congregation of St Joseph's Church, upset that parking charges will be levied on those wanting to worship.
- 2.14 Changes to the permit issuing criteria are not within the scope of this current review but could be considered in a future review of the town centre. The changes from single yellow line to double yellow line in London Road and Epsom Road are intended to resolve the safety, access and traffic flow issues caused by parking outside the present operational hours of the single yellow lines. In general, the changes from single yellow line to double yellow lines in Dene Road are intended to protect points of access, and improve sight lines around junctions. Nevertheless, additional formalised parking spaces are being created.
- 2.15 In terms of the proposed extension in the hours over which the single yellow lines operate, the reasons for doing so are twofold. Given that the roads are well utilised in the evening by traffic due to its proximity to venues associated with the evening economy, vehicles parked on single yellow lines in the evening have a similar impact on safety, access and flow, as they would if they were to park on the single yellow lines during the day. Another reason for extending the operational hours of the single yellow lines so that it matches the operational hours of the parking bays is the clarity of restrictions for motorists.
- 2.16 Extending the operational hours of the single yellow lines would also enable zone boundary signs, highlighting the different operational hours, to be placed on each of the entrance into Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens. Increased compliance due to more obvious signing would improve the effectiveness of the changes.
- 2.18 Officers circulated the representations to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.19 It is recommended that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

Rivermount Gardens

- 2.19 The representations associated with the proposals to introduce controls with Rivermount Gardens and include it within Area G of the CPZ appear in [Annexe 6.3](#).
- 2.20 Five representations were received. The two received from residents of the road strongly supported the introduction of the proposals. The three representations objecting to the proposals came from non-residents that use

the road for long-stay parking during the week. The main reason given for objecting was the loss of a free all-day parking facility so close to the town centre. Two of those objecting suggested that the households within the road have ample off-street parking and therefore do not rely on the on-street space available.

- 2.21 However, the parking by non-residents reduces the width of the road and causes issues round the junction and crest of the hill, which is the primary reason for the development of the proposals. By resolving these issues through the proposed use of double and single yellow lines, the opportunity for parking to be accommodated is reduced and it is proposed to prioritise the remaining space for residents in catchment area G and their visitors.
- 2.22 Officers circulated the representations to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.23 It is recommended that the proposals be implemented as advertised.

St Luke's Square

- 2.24 The representations associated with the proposed introduction of controls within St Luke's Square, St Catherine's Park, St Bartholomew's Court and St Thomas's Mews appear in Annexe 6.
- 2.25 26 representations were received. Of these, 16 either fully endorse the proposals (8), or are supportive in principal but would prefer to see changes to the proposals (8). All of the supportive representations were from those directly affected by the controls, namely residents of St Luke's Square, St Catherine's Park, St Bartholomew's Court and St Thomas's Mews, and including the St Luke's Residents' Association.
- 2.26 A similar number of those wanting changes to the proposals wanted more and less controls. Of the 10 representees that objected, two came from the St Luke's Park area. One came from the St Luke's Park Residents' Association (SLPRA). Some of those that responded suggested that there was not a parking problem in St Luke's Square. Others, including the SLPRA suggested the controls were excessive and would lead to displacement into their part of the development, due to the loss of parking. The loss of parking was a feature of the objections received from those within St Luke's Square.
- 2.27 The controls advertised are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred.
- 2.28 Officers circulated the representations to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.29 It is recommended that the proposals be implemented as advertised.

ITEM 7

Other Changes

- 2.30 Of the 40 locations where proposals have been developed to deal with specific 'more minor' issues, only eight of them result in representations received. Annexe 6.5 lists these.
- 2.31 These seven locations generated 14 representations, one of which was a 37-signature petition.
- 2.32 In respect to the proposals to create more on-street space in Abbot Road, the only representation received opposed the introduction of additional on-street parking. The resident claimed that the area opposite the proposed parking place was a turning facility. We consider that the area is a disused vehicle access and there are places that are more suitable in the road to turn. We therefore recommend implementing the change as proposed.
- 2.33 With regard to the proposal to introduce a formalised disabled badge holders' only space in Cline Road, two representations were received. Both indicated that the blue-badge-holding resident for which the bay was being considered moved elsewhere. We therefore do not recommend implementing this proposal.
- 2.34 Two representations were received objecting to the proposed change in Curling Vale. The proposal was for introduction for a disabled badge holder's bay and a change to accommodate a recently introduced vehicle crossover. Both objected to the change, primarily on the grounds of loss of space and facility. However, the right to gain access on and off the public highway and the priority given to those with mobility issues must take precedence and we recommend implementing this proposal.
- 2.35 The proposal in Josephs Road improve access by slightly reducing the size of a parking place outside No. 10 lead to a request to do the same outside No. 7. In addition to the change outside No. 10 we recommend the shared-use parking place on the east side of the access to No. 7 is reduced by around one meter and to compensate the permit only space on the west side is increased in length by the same amount.
- 2.36 The proposal to introduce double yellow lines at the end of Margaret Road received two objections from residents concerned about not being able to park in the evening. With parking at the end of Margaret Road it is very difficult for vehicles to turn on the highway and in our view the area needs to be restricted to allow safe use of the highway. We recommend implementing this proposal.
- 2.37 In respect to the proposal to change a parking bay in Walnut Tree Close from shared-use to permit only two residents welcomed the change. However a care organisation based at No. 18 submitted a petition of 37 signatures objecting. They are concerned that the proposal would reduce parking for their visitors and staff who need to make trips to the lower part of Walnut Tree Close and elsewhere in the town centre. There are public parking facilities nearby for business users. Residents who need regular assistance to live independently in their homes can obtain a carers permit, which they can give to carers who need to park. There is considerable pressure on all

parking in Walnut Tree Close and it is recommended that the priority for space is made in favour of residents and the proposal is implemented.

- 2.38 All the comments received in response to the proposal for Warren Road related to parking places and arrangements in Tangier Road. This area is not being considered as part of the current review but could be considered during the next review of the town centre.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Committee must consider the representations received. It needs to decide whether to implement the proposals as original advertised, or implement the proposals with the changes or to drop some or all of the proposals. The proposals have been formally advertised and only minor amendments made at this stage. If the committee wish to make significant changes, the relevant proposals would need to be re-advertised to give road users the opportunity to comment.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 The proposals have been formally advertised in the Surrey Advertiser and by using street notices at the particular locations. For the major proposals, properties in the areas affected have been written to notify them of the proposals and there has been consultation before the proposals were advertised.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 To create the order and implement the signs and lines required to give affect to the proposals we estimate will cost no more than £50,000. If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals, the money will come from the Guildford on-street parking account. The extension of restrictions around Dene Road will also increase the hours pay and display operates in this area from 6pm to 9pm and include Sundays. We estimated that an additional £10,000 to £20,000 per annum maybe taken in pay and display charges and will off set the additional cost of enforcing these restrictions.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Blue badge holders can park in disabled parking bays without time limit or on yellow lines for up to three hours and are exempt from charges for parking on-street. They can also park for an unlimited period in residents or shared-use parking places.
- 6.2 Carers permits are available for the use of either carers or family members who help residents who require regular visits to maintain an independent lifestyle and remain at home.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The proposals will affect all road users in the areas where restrictions are proposed and particularly residents. All the proposals have been publicised, many have drawn comments from residents and local communities, and these have been carefully considered.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

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 where large, public service vehicles utilise relatively narrow roads.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

We have carefully considered the representations received and recommend the Committee implemented the proposals as follows:

- 9.1 in respect to the area around Cranley Road schools, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to the parking restrictions set out in Annexe 1 but with minor amendments which lessen the proposed level of control. The minor amendments are to increase the amount of 4 hour limited waiting shared use parking in Hillier Road and not to create a parking bay outside 60/62 Tormead Road (paragraphs 2.7 & 2.8) and shown in Annexe 7
- 9.2 in respect to the Dene Road Area, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to parking restrictions set out in Annexe 2, so that the controls can be implemented
- 9.3 in respect to Rivermount Gardens, the traffic regulation order is made as advertised and shown in Annexe 3, so that the controls can be implemented and the road becomes part of Area G of the Guildford town centre Controlled Parking Zone
- 9.4 in respect to St Luke's Square, the traffic regulation order is made as advertised and shown in Annexe 4, so that the controls can be implemented
- 9.5 in respect to the other changes shown in Annexe 5, it makes the traffic regulation order as previously advertised, with minor amendments, so that the controls can be implemented. The minor amendments being the deletion of the proposed disabled bay in Cline Road (2.33) and the adjustment of parking around the access to No. 7 Josephs Road (2.35)
- 9.6 the agreed controls are implemented and the implementation funded from the on-street account

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to implement the changes we will engage a contractor to carry out the work to erect signs and lay the lines required. A public notice will be placed in the Surrey Advertiser, street notices placed in areas where the changes will be introduced, anyone who has made a representation will be written to and the order will be made.
- 10.2 In the case of the Dene Road area, Rivermount Gardens and St Lukes, all properties in the areas will be sent a letter explaining the changes.

Contact Officer:

Kevin McKee, Parking Services, Manager (01483 444530)

Consulted:

Road users

Residents

Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

1 – Plans of Cranley Road proposals formally advertised

2 - Plans of Dene Road proposals formally advertised

3 – Plan of Rivermount Gardens proposals formally advertised

4 – Plan of St Luke's Square proposals formally advertised

5 – List Other Changes formally advertised

6.1-6.5 – Representation associated with the various proposals *

7 - Revised proposals for Cranley Road recommended following consideration of representations

Sources/background papers:

- Item 6, Local Committee (Guildford), 22 September 2011
- Item 9, Local Committee (Guildford), 13 June 2012
- Item 8, Local Committee (Guildford), 13 March 2013

* Annexe 6.1 – 6.5 will be available online and provided as hard copy on request. A hard copy will be available for consultation at Guildford Borough Council

This page is intentionally left blank