

Guildford Parking Review 2022

Ash Division

Ash Street Overview

Response Rate	8%
Fully Support	3
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	6
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	2
Neither / Nor	2
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	1
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	12
Fully Oppose	17

*of the 540 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reason for Support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents	Turnover of space
15	9	6	2

Reason for Opposition

Less parking	There isn't a parking issue	Displacement	Turnover of space	Lines/Signs look unsightly	Waste of money
8	3	17	2	3	3

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	84%
Frequently visit the area	14%
Work locally	2%

The proposals:

These proposals were developed based on parking issues around the shop in Ash Street. Issues reported here includes visitors blocking driveways, pavement parking and congestion. There are existing controls here so the proposals are designed to be only slight tweaks to the current arrangement but would reduce visitor parking here slightly.

Comments:

There was a lot of comments regarding these proposals and despite being very slight changes it was clear that there was a lot of concern for the effect this may have on surrounding roads. Reducing the visitor parking here even slightly was not popular and many commented that the problems could be managed with more effective enforcement of the current restrictions. There were representations supporting the proposals and most of those in favour wanted more restrictions.

The decision:

The decision is not to implement the proposals. It is understood that there is an issue here and the comments in favour of the proposals have been taken on board, however, following the feedback it is the view that these proposals in silo may not be the best solution as they may push the issues to surrounding roads which many residents are concerned about. If the issues here continue then further proposals could be developed but there would need to be considerations for the wider area. Issues here could also be improved with more enforcement and residents can report issues to our enforcement team.

Response Rate	8.7%
Fully Support	18
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	15
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	2
Neither / Nor	5
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	3
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	10
Fully Oppose	40

*of the 1073 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reason for Support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents	Turnover of space
28	22	21	15

Reason for Opposition

Reduce parking	There isn't a parking issue	Displacement	Waste of money	Expensive
32	12	28	14	6

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	76%
Frequently visit the area	19%
Local business owner / employee	5%

The proposals:

These proposals were developed based on parking issues around the shops around the Highstreet and requests to improve turnover of vehicles so that more customers can park. The designs therefore considered displacement parking and more controls were proposed in the areas that could become busier as a result. In addition, there was an extension to the double yellow line restrictions at the top of Ash Hill Road to protect the verge which has become damaged by vehicle parking already.

Comments:

The majority of residents comments expressed significant opposition to the proposals. Despite being a Highstreet area, there is a number of residential properties nearby or above commercial premises and many do not have off street parking. There were many responses that fully supported the proposals but did not offer further comments and therefore it is hard to establish the perspective. The opposition offered much more detail in that there is a conflict between residents and visitors and the time limited restrictions may create more problems for the roads. If parking is pushed further down this may cause further safety and access issues in the form of bottlenecks. Some of the businesses commented in favour of the proposals to improve turnover and remain competitive during challenging times however there were also representations from staff members that said they would have difficulty being able to continue working here if parking was restricted.

The decision:

It's been decided to drop the majority of the proposals, apart from the small extension of Double Yellow Line on Ash Hill Road. This is to protect the verge from further damage from vehicles parking which is already occurring. Whilst the consultation showed there is some desire to improve parking here, there are a large number of residents which the current arrangement works for. Whilst it's appreciated that the businesses could further benefit from greater turnover for customers, displacing residents parking could ultimately create more safety issues than it solves, as well as impacting their employees. If the demand for parking here grows then further controls may need to be reconsidered but this should be looked at on balance with the need for residential parking.

Response Rate	26.6%
Fully Support	7
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	14
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Neither / Nor	3
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	7
Fully Oppose	9

*of the 154 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

			Spaces available more quickly
Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents	
20	9	8	2

Reasons for opposition

There will be less parking	There isn't a parking issue	It will push the problem to other roads	Waste of Money	Lines/Signs look unsightly
11	6	12	7	2

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	90%
Moving to the area	3%
Frequently visit the area	7%

The proposals:

The area was highlighted due to issues of visibility around its junctions and bends.

Comments:

It became clear from the feedback that further controls were desired here. The original scheme had been implemented some time ago and included a number of unrestricted areas, requested by residents at the time, as there was a concern that parking would increase speeding down prospect road. With this in mind, further proposals have been developed and will be proposed in the next review.

The decision:

The proposals are to be implemented in full and further controls are proposed in Guildford Parking Review 2023.

Pirbright Overview

Response Rate	41.3%*
Fully Support	7
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	4
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	3
Neither / Nor	2
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	3
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	7
Fully Oppose	7

*of the 80 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reason for Support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents	Turnover of space
16	12	11	2

Reason for Opposition

Less parking	There isn't a parking issue	Displacement	Turnover of space	Lines/Signs look unsightly	Waste of money
8	3	17	2	3	3

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	78%
Frequently visit the area	9%
Parish Councillor	3%
Own a business or work nearby	6%

The proposals:

These proposals were developed after a request from the Parish Council around parking on Avenue De Cagny causing issues for access, safety and visibility. Whilst the main issues were being experienced around the green, the proposals considered displacement parking into the other roads and focused on protecting the junctions and bends. The restrictions on Avenue De Cagny allows for some parking and access to the small car park at the northern side.

Comments:

Some of the feedback from businesses was negative, as there will be some impact on parking for visitors. In addition, there is some resistance to the introduction of restrictions overall as there is a demand for parking and finite space. However, there is a number of comments which acknowledge that at peak times the parking can become obstructive and dangerous. There were comments around preventing parking on the crossing on the southeastern side, outside the shops as this can obstruct visibility which is particularly concerning at school times. On the other hand, the businesses do rely on the ability to park outside the store for deliveries or collections. Comments from residents around White Hart corner also objected to the restrictions being placed outside their properties.

The decision:

Based on the feedback the proposals have been amended to balance the needs of residents and visitors. The aim is to minimise the impact on parking near the shops but it was the view that the road table needs to be clear of parking for the safety of pedestrians crossing. I understand this may impact the businesses which are directly outside but this is an important safety concern shared by the council and the community in the feedback. There is still adequate parking opportunities and loading / unloading is able to take place on double yellows. Restrictions on White Hart Corner and the A324 are to be dropped as whilst this was included to prevent displacement, there is not an issue here currently and based on the feedback this is not considered necessary. It is therefore recommended that the proposals are implemented in part.

Response Rate	5%
Fully Support	0
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	3
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Neither / Nor	2
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	2

*of the 159 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reason for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
4	3	3

Reason for opposition

There isn't a parking issue	Cause displacement	Lines/Signs look unsightly	Waste of Money
2	3	1	1

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	75%
Frequently visit the area	25%

The proposals:

The issues here largely surround parking during school pick up / drop off, whereby vehicles are causing damages to the verge and creating challenges for residents parking. Therefore the design protects the junctions and bends whilst introducing a no waiting single yellow line restriction to mitigate the issues at school time but accommodate residents outside of these times.

Comments:

Of those which supported the majority wanted the scheme to be more restrictive, largely aimed at non-residents. Another view conveyed is that the area is being over developed and these restrictions will only create more problems. The other comments objecting to the proposals also concern

displacement. Other comments include that residents would like to see more investment converting street lights to EV chargers and that speeding is more of an issue here than parking.

The decision:

The only real way to prioritise residents is a permit scheme and these have many implications for residents, not all of them positive. Residents can understand the pros and cons of such a scheme on our website but as it can be so impactful, we do ask for a demonstration of support from a majority of the residents in an area before we could consider such a scheme. Whilst it is appreciated that the impact of development can be frustrating, this is a separate issue, and we must manage the highway space as best we can. It is also understood that parking restrictions can cause displacement however there is a point where restrictions are the only way to prevent obstructive or dangerous parking. Further controls can be considered in the future, if necessary, but it is sometimes less popular to propose larger schemes as surrounding roads which aren't currently experiencing any issues object. The proposed scheme seems a balanced approach based on the feedback and should improve the experience for residents during the peak times but also accommodate the needs of parents to collect the students safely. The restrictions are to be implemented as advertised.

Shere Division

The Street, West Clandon Overview

Response Rate	44%*
Fully Support	3
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	1
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	4

*of the 18 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
4	2	1

Reasons for opposition

Less parking
1

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	62.5%
Councillor	25%
Teacher	12.5%

The proposals:

These proposals came from a historic request from the school which wanted restrictions to improve the access and safety near the school. The design therefore included the formalisation of the School Keep Clear markings which are already in place and the introduction of a No Waiting single yellow line restriction to operate during the working day.

Comments:

Whilst there was a positive response from some of the residents, there was a lot of negative feedback from the school itself, including the head teacher. They were not aware of the historic request and suggest that issues here are not to do with parking but rather speeding. There was however some support from residents in the vicinity but only 2 offered comments with their

support. They stated that parking on this A road causes congestion and can force pedestrians into the road.

The decision:

Whilst there is some support for the proposals, the issues do not appear to be as widespread as the original request suggests. In addition, the school and other councillors feel the issue is being managed effectively and therefore it is the view that the no waiting proposals should not be implemented. We do however recommend the existing School Keep Clear markings are made enforceable as these are currently advisory and this will help protect from future enforcement issues. Therefore, the proposals are to be implemented in part.

New Road Chilworth Overview

Response Rate	22.3%*
Fully Support	3
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	5
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	2
Neither / Nor	1
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	2
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	6
Fully Oppose	38

*of the 255 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
17	10	11

Reasons for opposition

There will be less parking	There isn't a parking issue	It will push the problem to other roads	Allow for spaces to become available more quickly	Lines/Signs look unsightly	Waste of money
37	18	32	1	2	13

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	77%
Frequently visit the area	18%
Parish Council	2%
Own a business or work close by	3%

The proposals:

The proposals were designed to reduce congestion and improve safety as there is a pressure on on-street parking from both residents and visitors to the school. The design aims to prevent parking on both sides of the road and opposite junctions. In addition, parking can occur around the bend and towards the rail crossing particularly if there are local events like football matches at the school. Therefore, restrictions were also proposed on the bend as you leave New Road.

Comments:

There was significant objection to these proposals. Most comments were made around the need for parking for residents as most houses do not have off street parking, there is further concern that this will also push parking into the side roads. There has also been increased demand due to new developments in the area. Many also expressed concerns that introducing restrictions to reduce parking on the main road would increase the speed of traffic near the school as the road is very straight. Some feedback did suggest No Waiting restrictions to operate at school pick up and drop off time to improve congestion during these peak times and some mentioned a residents parking scheme. Comments regarding the proposals on the bend were largely supportive and mention there is a concern for pedestrians as vehicles can block the entrance to the bridle path.

The decision:

Time limited waiting restrictions to operate at certain times could be considered in the future if parking were to become more challenging, but this would also mean residents would need to move vehicles during the day and could influence speed of cars during these times. From the feedback it is unlikely to be popular here unless there are speed controls introduced as the parking does seem to create a natural traffic calming effect. However, most objections seemed to refer to the restrictions on the eastern side of New Road. As most feedback centred around the lack of off-street parking it is our view that the proposals near the railway crossing would be beneficial in improving safety and visibility for both motorists and pedestrians near the bend. As the nearby properties seem to have off street parking this should also have minimal impact on residents and improve accessibility during local events. Therefore, restrictions should be implemented in part.

Station Road, Gomshall Overview

Response Rate	17.1%
Fully Support	4
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	2
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	6

*of the 70 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents	There will be less parking
6	3	2	4

Reasons for opposition

There will be less parking	There isn't a parking issue	It will push the problem to other roads	Waste of money
6	2	4	2

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	100%
---------------------------------	------

The proposals:

The proposals have been designed to prevent parking on this sharp corner as you enter the village of Gomshall. There are a number of residential properties on this corner which do not have off street parking and the village itself is largely based around this main road which is quite a busy route. Parking here means that traffic needs to pull out into the opposite side of the carriageway to pass and as it is a corner, there is little visibility of oncoming traffic.

Comments:

Many comments in support feel very strongly the restrictions should be implemented here, as parking on this corner is reducing visibility and creating risks, particularly when drivers are not driving sensibly. The majority of those which are against the restrictions seem to be those with properties on the corner which are heavily reliant on the parking near their homes, particularly as there is little other off-street parking in the village. However there does seem to be some suggestion that if alternative parking was available to these residents they would not be as strongly opposed.

The decision:

The feedback suggests the restrictions should be implemented however we are exploring the ability to move the bus stop which will in turn offer some parking opportunities for residents. If this can be reached, then the restrictions will be implemented in full.

Guildford East

Bowers Farm Drive Overview

Response Rate	12.7%*
Fully Support	6
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	3
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	1
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	1

*of the 86 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
9	8	5

Reasons for opposition

It will push the problem to other roads	There isn't a parking issue	Waste of money
1	1	1

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	81%
Frequently visit the area	9%
Neighbourhood Forum	9%

The proposals:

The request was for more double yellow lines here as it is a bus route and a busy road near public amenities.

Comments:

Most of the comments were supportive of the restrictions here. One comment mentioned that care must be taken to ensure that visitor parking is not pushed to other roads as per the Neighbourhood Plan. Another in support mentioned that they were tired of having to queue here in order to access

their road during busy periods and that the Supermarket car park could easily accommodate these vehicles. There was only one objection which suggested there wasn't an issue here.

The decision:

Whilst it is not certain what the vehicles parked here are in the area for, there is ample opportunities for visitor parking in the supermarket car park opposite the proposals. Therefore, these proposals should not cause displacement to the surrounding roads. As the majority of responses were positive and only received one objection then the scheme should be implemented as advertised.

London Road, Burpham Overview

Response Rate	17.3%
Fully Support	1
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	1
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Fully Oppose	6

*of the 52 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
1	1	1

Reasons for opposition

Less parking	No parking issue	Cause displacement	Lines/Signs look unsightly	Waste of money	Expensive
4	3	3	1	1	3

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	89%
---------------------------------	-----

Frequently visit the area	11%
---------------------------	-----

The proposals:

These proposals were developed as parking is building up in the service road and the request was from residents which are struggling to park. The only true way to prioritise residents over visitors is a permit scheme and to implement that here in isolation is disproportionately restrictive and unlikely to be beneficial to residents. Therefore, it was proposed to introduce a small amount of no waiting restrictions to improve access and movement around the service road to at least ensure that vehicles could manoeuvre in and out safely.

Comments:

There were a number of comments objecting to these proposals. Only two showed support but in the comments mentioned creating a cycle lane here. The other comment was more in favour of a residents parking scheme. Of the comments against the proposals, one mentioned as a resident with a disabled child they rely on the unrestricted parking here for carers. Another comment suggested that there are no issues here and that it does not need to be controlled.

The decision:

From the feedback it is clear that this is not popular with the majority of residents, and these are the main user group affected by the issues here. In addition, there were proposals for a cycle lane in the area at the time and therefore any amendments to this area should be considered after this project has been concluded to avoid any conflict. Therefore, the proposals are not to be implemented.

Shalford Division

Ash Green Lane West Overview

Response Rate	7.4%*
Fully Support	1
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	4
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	4

*of the 135 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reason for Support

Safety	Prioritise residents	Ease congestion
5	3	3

Reason for Opposition

Less parking	No parking issue	Displacement	Waste of money
2	3	4	3

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	100%
---------------------------------	------

The proposals:

Issues have been reported in this new build development around access and visibility. The estate is near a school and parking can increase at school times in the entrance to the estate. Some properties have off street parking but not all and some residents have multiple vehicles. The proposals were designed mainly focusing on the access points of the estate and protecting the junctions and bends but with the aim of having too much impact on available space.

Comments:

From the feedback most of those that desired restrictions felt the design should be more restrictive and then there were a number of representations that felt strongly against implementing any. It was expressed that some residents chose to live here based on the availability of parking and this would have impacted their decision to move there.

The decision:

It is understood that some residents do not have off street parking here and every effort has been made to protect availability of space, but it is also clear that others feel heavily impacted by the parking taking place. It is appreciated that some desire more restrictions, but we aim to find a balance between these groups of residents and prioritise the main safety issues observed. Removing all parking on the entrance to Ash Green Lane West is only likely to push the problem further into the cul-de-sac so these designs are felt to be a balanced approach. More restrictions can be proposed if necessary. Therefore, the proposals should be implemented in full.

Elstead Road Proposals Overview

Response Rate	22.3%*
Fully Support	2
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	1
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	4
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	5
Fully Oppose	2

*of the 67 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reason for support

Safety	1
Ease congestion	2

Reasons for opposition

Less Parking	1
Isn't a parking issue	1
Spaces will become available more quickly	1
Impact Businesses / Local amenities	2

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	100%
--------------------------	------

The proposals:

Parking issues have developed here following a popular establishment in the area meaning visitors and residents must compete for space. In addition, this is creating parking further down the country lanes, obstructing visibility and causing congestion.

Comments:

There were a lot of conflicting views on these proposals. Whilst many seem to agree that controls are required here, there was a variation in the level of restriction desired. Whilst some comments favoured a permit scheme, they also did not agree with the rules we had proposed, for example one permit per household. Other comments highlighted that the area is rural and designated as a conservation area, therefore lines would impact this area. A number of comments raised concerns for displacement. One asked

The decision:

Unfortunately, a permit scheme is the only tool we have to prioritise a user group over another. Even though this is a relatively small scheme, these are usually complex in nature as we need to establish who is entitled to a permit, any exceptions to this and how the scheme is to work operationally. It is understood that residents may have different needs but with limited space here, we felt a limit of one permit per vehicle was the fairest way to accommodate the majority of residents. From the feedback there is not enough support for the permit scheme in its current format. However, as there is clearly an issue felt here by the residents, the No Waiting restrictions seem a more balanced approach to address the safety concerns. The design should allow for parking to continue but just ensure that the junctions and bends are protected, as well as provided passing places to ensure traffic flow. The resident's parking scheme is not to be implemented. The no waiting restrictions should be implemented but by using conservation lining which will be more in keeping with the nature of the area.

Oxenden Road Overview

Response Rate	9.8%
Fully Support	1
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	2
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	1
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	2

*of the 61 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
2	3	3

Reasons for opposition

Less parking	No parking issue	Cause displacement	Turnover of space	Waste of money
2	1	2	1	1

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	100%
---------------------------------	------

The proposals:

The issue here was parking on the verge opposite prevents pedestrian access to the footway. At the same time, it was decided that the junctions should be protected to ensure visibility and access to the cul-de-sac opposite.

Comments:

There were only a couple of comments to these proposals. Of those that did, commented on a number of issues on Oxenden Road, including the speed of traffic and other parking issues. Most of those in support desired more restrictions than proposed. Those against suggested this will make things harder for them to park. One comment does mention that this could push parking to other places.

The decision:

The proposals aimed to balance the needs of pedestrians here and protect access to the path rather than a widespread scheme. It's appreciated that there are other issues with parking on this road but there is also a reliance on this parking. It was felt a larger scheme would be unpopular and displacement would be significant so considerations would need to be given to restrictions into side roads too. At this point it is acknowledged that some would like more restrictions here and some prefer the flexibility of none, however we must balance the needs of user groups and in this case, we feel the pedestrian access should be protected and displacement prevented onto the junction opposite. The loss of these spaces is unlikely to cause a huge issue of displacement but if more issues appear in future, then more controls can be considered. Implement as advertised.

The Cardinals, Tongham Overview

Response Rate	9.9%*
Fully Support	3
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	2
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Fully Oppose	2

*of the 91 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Reduce congestion	Prioritise residents	Turnover of space
6	3	2	1

Reasons for opposition

Less parking	No parking issue	Cause displacement	Turnover of space
2	2	2	1

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	88%
Frequently visit the area	11%

The proposals:

The aim of the scheme was designed to keep sight lines of the junctions clear and prevent displacement. At the same time, formalising the School Keep Clear markings and introducing a no waiting restriction during pick up and drop off times will improve congestion and safety during the peak times.

Comments:

Not many comments were received in relation to these proposals but there was slightly more support than opposition. Comments suggested the main issues are around school times and pavement parking by parents causes others to have to walk in the road. Comments opposed to the

scheme mention that the school issues do not affect them and do not want restrictions outside their own house. Some expressed the desire for more restrictions but also wished for more parking to be created.

The decision:

There is clearly an issue at school time which these proposals will mitigate as well as improve safety around the school. Creating more parking is not something we can do so implementing more restrictions will have further impact on available space and could push the problems further, as well as have a greater impact on residents. Therefore, the decision is to implement in full.

The Street, Puttenham Overview

Response Rate	177%*
Fully Support	6
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	6
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	3
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	9
Fully Oppose	41

*of the 37 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents	Turnover of space
14	12	7	3

Reasons for opposition

Less parking	No parking issue	Cause displacement	Turnover of space	Lines/Signs look unsightly	Waste of money
39	16	41	2	8	13

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	62%
Frequently visit the area	35%
Other	3%

The proposals:

The request was to address parking issues around the public house. The location scored higher due to its proximity to the school. The proposals were developed to create better visibility and keep the junctions clear.

Comments:

A lot of comments were received regarding these proposals, considerably more than those which were contacted about the consultation and there was significant objection. Whilst these proposals were developed for different reasons, it became clear that there have been separate plans to introduce controls here and local discussions on the matter. Therefore, whilst there were some in support of these proposals there are obviously factors relating to the schools that were not considered and the other proposals will be better to address these issues.

The decision:

The proposals are not to be implemented considering the level of opposition and the conflicting proposals being developed in relation to the school.

Guildford South

Park Street Proposals Overview

The proposals:

To allow for loading in the layby to further support surrounding businesses.

Comments:

No comments were received.

The decision:

The decision is to implement in full.

Elmside Proposals Overview

Response Rate	19%*
Fully Support	2
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	1
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	1

*of the 21 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reason for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
3	2	2

Reason for opposition

Less Parking
2

Consultation Demographic

Resident living close by	100%
--------------------------	------

The proposals:

The request was to remove the parking bay in order to accommodate a vehicle crossover.

Comments:

The proposals only received 4 representations and only one of those was fully opposed to the proposals. One comment mentioned that the majority of parking demand is at school time and these changes will have an impact on this. Two other representations showed support for the proposals as it will enable them to create off street parking.

The decision:

Whilst it is understood that this will reduce on-street parking here, there is some provisions regained by the off-street parking it will provide for residents. It is understood that residents are not the only user groups that rely on these spaces but considering this will be a loss of 1-2 spaces it is not believed that this will lead to significant issues here. The decision is to implement in full.

Horsleys

Guildford Road, East Horsley Overview

Response Rate	21.5%*
Fully Support	9
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	1
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	1

*of the 91 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
9	5	1

Reasons for opposition

There isn't a parking issue
1

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	82%
Own a business or work close by	9%
Frequently visit the area	9%

The proposals:

The issue reported here was mainly around pavement parking, however this parking is also causing issues for traffic as it is taking place on a busy A road approaching a bend.

Comments:

The only objection received was from the business fronting the restrictions. They feel very strongly that the restrictions proposed will negatively impact the business and obstruct their business operations. They expressed that nearby residential roads all have private parking which makes it very hard for their customers to find places to park. They also expressed a willingness to engage to prevent these restrictions from being implemented and find some local agreement. On the other hand, residents in the nearby roads very strongly supported the proposals and describe how the parking here causes significant visibility issues for them and presents a danger to them when they exit on to the A246. They also describe the congestion caused by parking here and how they have witnessed a number of near misses as vehicles try to overtake the parked vehicles.

The decision:

Whilst it is understood that the restrictions will have an impact on the business, there is an opportunity for them to accommodate some off-street parking for customers. Considering how busy the road is and the vicinity to the sharp bend, parking here does have an impact on safety and visibility. In addition, pavement parking is also causing an obstruction to other user groups in this area and we must try and balance the needs. However, it is important to note that there is an exemption for parking on double yellow lines for the purpose of loading and unloading. Therefore, it should be considered that whilst this is not an appropriate place to park for long durations, this should allow the business to continue to operate successfully. Therefore the proposals are to be implemented in full.

Guildford West

Worplesdon Road / Shepherd's Hill Road Overview

Response Rate	3.1%
Fully Support	1
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	1
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	0
Fully Oppose	4

*of the 192 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

Safety	Less congestion	Prioritise residents	Turnover of space
	1	1	1

Reasons for opposition

Less parking	No parking issue	Cause displacement	Turnover of space	Lines/Signs look unsightly	Waste of money	Expensive
3	3	2	1	2	3	1

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	100%
---------------------------------	------

The proposals:

These were designed to prevent pavement parking and protect junctions around a busy main road in and out of Guildford. There are a lot of residential streets leading off Worplesdon Road, as well as the A road itself being fronted by lots of properties with a mixture of on/off street parking. Aside from this there are a number of businesses, and this area includes a convenience store which can attract customer parking. The design focuses mainly on preventing parking from the vicinity of the junctions so not to impact residents disproportionately.

Comments:

Of those which objected, only one offered comments which stated they would struggle to park if these were implemented as they would be outside their property. Those that supported mentioned that they wanted a bollard installed to prevent pavement parking in front of the shop but these restrictions will hopefully help.

The decision:

Whilst there were more objections than support, there was also a large number of residents which did not object to the proposals. Of the 4 objections, only one offered reasons for their objections and whilst it is appreciated that those properties directly behind the restrictions may be impacted, there are still other parking opportunities nearby that are not in the vicinity of the junctions. Therefore, the proposals should be implemented in full.

Worplesdon Road / Regalfield Close Overview

Response Rate	44%
Fully Support	8
Generally Supportive – Prefer More Restrictive	3
Generally Supportive – Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Neither / Nor	0
Generally Opposed – Prefer More Restrictive	0
Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	1
Fully Oppose	1

*of the 32 households directly informed of the proposals.

Reasons for support

	Less congestion	Prioritise residents
Safety	5	4
12		

Reasons for opposition

	It will push the problem to other roads	Waste of money
There will be less parking	2	1
3		

Consultation demographic

Resident living close by	100%
--------------------------	------

The proposals:

Residents of Regalfield Close have difficulty entering and exiting the road due to parking close to the junction. Worplesdon Road is a busy main route in and out of Guildford so pulling out when visibility is obscured is difficult. In addition there are residential properties either side of the side road which rely on on-street parking. The design is simply to re-enforce the sight lines on this road and

Comments:

Most of the comments are positive for these proposals. One comment requested slightly less controls inside the side road to accommodate more parking however 3 were in support of more controls. The objection simply asked for speed restrictions as the houses can be shaken by the speeds on Worplesdon Road.

The decision:

As there was a clear level of support for the controls here the proposals should be implemented in full.

EV Proposals Overview

Proposals /Response Rate	Full Support	Generally Supportive - Prefer More Restrictive	Generally Supportive - Prefer Less Restrictive	Neither / Nor	Generally Opposed - Prefer More Restrictive	Generally Opposed - Prefer Less Restrictive	Fully Oppose
Nettles Terrace 5.7%	2	0	2	0	0	2	4
Onslow Road 4.2%	0	0	0	0	2	2	1
Recreation Road 1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Stocton Road 4.1%	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Quarry Street 3.8%	4	1	1	0	0	0	0
William Road 7%	0	0	0	2	0	1	2
Wodeland Avenue 5.1%	0	0	0	1	0	1	0

Reasons for support

	Ease congestion	Prioritise residents	Turnover of space	Charge my EV	To purchase an EV
Nettles Terrace	0	1	0	1	1
Onslow Road	2	0	0	0	0
Recreation Road	0	0	0	0	0
Stocton Road	0	0	0	1	1
Quarry Street	1	5	1	0	0

William Road	0	2	1	0	1
Wodeland Avenue	0	0	0	0	0

Reasons for opposition

	Less Parking	Cause displacement	Expensive
Nettles Terrace	4	1	0
Onslow Road	2	3	0
Recreation Road	1	0	1
Stocton Road	0	0	1
Quarry Street	1	0	0
William Road	3	1	0
Wodeland Avenue	1	0	0

Consultation Demographic

	Resident living close by	Resident in other part of Guildford	Frequently visit the area	Own a business or work in this area	Other
Nettles Terrace	100%				
Onslow Road	60%	20%			20%
Recreation Road	100%				
Stocton Road	100%				
Quarry Street	60%		40%		
William Road	80%			20%	
Wodeland Avenue	100%				

The proposals:

The proposals were to introduce a number of EV bays in order to facilitate charging vehicles, particularly focused on the areas which have on street parking. There were also some amendments to the bays in Wodeland Avenue and Quarry Street to make the bays without charging points accessible to permit holders again.

Comments:

As these areas are heavily reliant on on-street parking there was understandably some concerns about the bays being empty due to electric car ownership. There were a number that supported as this will enable them to charge an existing EV or purchase one.

The decision:

The proposals are to be implemented in full with the slight amendments to the restrictions in to ensure the need of on-street charging facilities is balanced with residents need for on street parking.