

Farnham Infrastructure Programme parking changes: Decision report

**A document explaining our final decisions on
proposed parking schemes following public
feedback**

Contents

Introduction	2
Farnham – All Streets / Entire Scheme	3
Farnham – High Park Road.....	5
Farnham – Park Row	6
Farnham – Castle Street	7
Farnham – The Borough	11
Farnham – West Street	12
Farnham – Downing Street	13
Farnham – Bear Lane	14
Farnham – East Street	15
Farnham – South Street.....	16
Farnham – Victoria Road	17
Farnham – Union Road.....	18
Farnham – Longbridge.....	19
Farnham – Upper Church Lane.....	20
Farnham – Lower Church Lane.....	21



Introduction

The Farnham Infrastructure Programme parking changes, which were agreed for advertisement by the county councillor for Farnham Central ([Andy MacLeod](#)) and the Parking and Traffic Enforcement Team manager in October 2023, were advertised from 1 December 2023 to 5 January 2024. As part of this process, over 40 street notices were erected along all streets within Farnham town centre where parking changes were proposed, and a formal notice was published in the Surrey Advertiser.

All these documents referred members of the public to drawings and a statement of reasons document available online via the webpage: www.surreycc.gov.uk/waverleyparking. This information was also made available to view at local libraries and council buildings as hard copies. Responses to the advertisement were received via an online form through the webpage above, or by letters being sent to the following address: FIP Parking Changes, Parking Team, Hazel House, Merrow Lane, Guildford, Surrey, GU4 7BQ. Members of the public were asked to submit either a support, comment or objection response.

During the advertisement period, there were 4 support responses, 15 comment responses and 101 objections. All responses have been read and considered in full, and the total number of responses for each location have been listed. However, for the purpose of this report, the responses have been summarised into key points only, followed by analysis and a decision on how to proceed following these considered responses.

The decisions made in this report are final and there is no appeal process. Any further requests for changes to these agreed restrictions will need to be submitted as part of a future [parking review of Waverley](#).

At locations where no objections or comments were received there is no analysis and the proposals will - unless otherwise stated - be introduced 'as advertised' i.e. without any changes from the advertised proposal. Where changes have been made, there will usually be a revised drawing in addition to the written description.

Important Note: Only the parking changes associated with the Farnham Infrastructure Programme were formally advertised during the period stated above. However, as these changes are linked to a proposed re-design of the carriageways, footways, and movement of traffic around the town (which were also shown on plans made available during the advertisement) a highly significant proportion of the feedback received was regarding these non-parking related changes and mixed within the feedback from each respondent. Therefore, for complete clarity and transparency, these summarised comments have been included in this report as well as the parking comments.

Some more extensive and detailed responses, including associated plans, have been read and viewed in full, but have been too complex to entirely summarise into key points. However, this information has been considered along with all other responses.

Farnham – All Streets / Entire Scheme

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 9
- Comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: See decision under each street in this report.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- There is already a lack of residents parking, and this scheme will reduce it further.
- The parking restrictions, road closures and conversions will turn Farnham into one large car park.
- There should be an entrance and exit to Brightwell's Yard from the A31 to take pressure away from the town centre.
- The routes are too complicated for cyclists to follow easily and will result in them not being used.
- Narrowing streets will increase friction between cyclists and motorists.
- The paving style should be more sympathetic to this conservation area.
- Various parts of the scheme need reviewing according to the Farnham Society's submission.
- Various objections to bus lanes and stops, paving and footway widening elements of scheme.
- Pedestrian crossing is needed on Longbridge.
- Cycle path road signs on West Street shown on lights without a designated lane.
- Scheme being driven by political agenda and not by residents.
- Scheme is simply against motorists.
- Narrowing and blockages will not improve traffic.

The comments related to the following additional points: -

- The scheme will displace some traffic to north and south Farnham and these issues should be addressed first.
- Public seating and hospitality seating should be kept separate.
- Bike stands and benches should be placed in between trees to reduce clutter and on the pavement area outside the Nelson's Arms.
- Seating areas should be marked to avoid conflict with pedestrians.

Note

Where respondents have mentioned streets specifically, these responses have been summarised under the relevant road names instead.

Analysis

Responses mentioning specific streets are addressed below under the relevant road name sections.

In terms of the objections and comments above:

- **Residents parking** – the only street where residents parking is affected is Castle Street – please see the relevant section below where this is addressed.
- **Traffic impact** – to understand the impact on traffic, traffic modelling of the proposals has been undertaken.
- **Entrance and exit to Brightwell's Yard from the A31** – please note that this is beyond the remit of the FIP town centre scheme and is a matter for the Brightwell's Yard scheme.
- **Cycling** – the LCWIP has been devised to get cyclists into the town, where the 20mph zone and cycle parking to be delivered by the FIP town centre scheme will help cyclists. The

widths of the proposed streets in the FIP town centre scheme have been designed to discourage traffic from overtaking cyclists in line with guidance.

- **Paving** – the paving style is being drawn up in consultation with specialist officers from Waverley Borough Council, Surrey County Council and relevant stakeholders.
- **Feedback** – all feedback received has been reviewed, including Farnham Society's submission.
- **Footway widening** – the scheme and associated footway widening has been devised in line with the aims of the agreed FIP which include improving the quality of place with clean air, healthier lifestyles and less dominance of traffic.
- **Bus stops** – some bus stops are proposed in line with traffic in accordance with Surrey County Council's Healthy Streets Design Guidance.
- **Longbridge pedestrian crossing** – this is beyond the scope of the FIP town centre scheme.
- **North and South Farnham traffic displacement** – this is being reviewed as a separate project within FIP.
- **Seating** – public seating and hospitality seating will be kept separate.

Farnham – High Park Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 48
- Comments: 4
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Making the road one way will significantly reduce access.
- Making the road one way will increase traffic on Castle Street and Bear Lane and will increase pollution.
- Park Row should remain open according to many High Park Road residents.
- The parking bay side will have to take all the loading and unloading, which will cause obstructions to driveways etc.
- A cycle lane on High Park Road and nowhere else does not make sense.
- The Farnham Bowls club visitors park on the south side of High Park Road on Sundays.
- The Farnham Bowls club would be forced to close with these restrictions.
- The Farnham Bowls club visitors already struggle for space as it is.
- The Farnham Bowls club members need to park nearby to transport heavy sports equipment (around 25kg in weight).
- The Farnham Bowls club members are mostly elderly and need to be able to park nearby.
- Deliveries to properties on the south side will not be possible as the north side parking bays and driveways will not allow enough space for deliveries.
- There is a cycle path already running parallel along the south of Farnham Park nearby.
- The road usage does not warrant a cycle lane here and the road is not wide enough for one.
- A cycle lane will not be any safer for cyclists.
- The proposed path does not link to other streets or routes, so it is pointless.
- There are very few cyclists that use High Park Road.
- Refuse collection vehicle would not be allowed to stop on the south side.
- The one way will cause more congestion and hold ups.
- The current arrangement works fine as it is.
- Road is residential and should not be part of a traffic solution for the town centre.
- Will impact on visitors, tradesman, and deliveries.
- Cyclists will be at risk from exiting drivers from Bear Lane.
- The one way will force drivers to go into the town to access High Park Road.
- Vehicle speeds will increase with a one-way street.
- Road should be 20mph.

The comments related to the following additional points: -

- High Park Road should all be residents only parking.
- One way should run east to west.
- There should be a turning facility at the junction of Park Row, High Park Road and Bear Lane.

Analysis

The decision is not to proceed with the High Park Road proposals following the large number of objections received and lack of support for this proposal.

Farnham – Park Row

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 21
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Closing Park Row will create more traffic and pollution in the town by limiting travel options.
- There are not enough cyclists to warrant the expense of all this.
- Traffic will have to travel through town centre increasing congestion and pollution.
- Only vans and lorries should be prohibited, not cars.
- It is very important for Castle Street residents to have access to the street via Park Row to avoid having to go through the busy town centre.
- Park Row is used for access when Castle Street is closed for events.
- Only HGVs need to be prevented following the damage to the Alms Houses.
- It's crucial this road is kept open, and the current arrangement is working.
- The width should be restricted to prevent HGVs passing through.

The comments related to the following additional points: -

- Park Row should be kept open to cyclists and resident vehicles only.

Analysis

The decision is not to proceed with the Park Row proposals following the large number of objections received and lack of support for this proposal.

Farnham – Castle Street

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 17
- Comments: 4
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Castle Street already has limited on-street parking which is to be reduced further.
- Improved facilities for the pub are at the detriment of residents and their parking spaces.
- Castle Street residents use Park Row when the town centre is congested, which will no longer be possible and will increase congestion in the town.
- Parking changes favour businesses and not residents.
- Shared spaces are not needed as there are spaces in Farnham's car parks.
- The pay and display spaces should be removed.
- Permit parking bay restrictions should apply 24 7.
- Permit holders should be allowed to use car parks as an overflow.
- Reduce the number of permits residents can buy to control demand.
- The Nelson's Arms spaces should be returned to residents.
- Proposals made by the Castle Street Residents Association with petition have not been considered as part of this scheme proposal.
- The number of spaces should meet the demand for permits.
- Residents already struggle to find space now, especially in the evenings, and this scheme will make it worse.
- More spaces should be allocated to residents and not businesses.
- Too many traffic signals will be required for the new turning options at the end of Castle Street and Downing Street which will clutter the town.
- Bus stop outside 12 to 15 not needed and should be made into more parking spaces.
- Footway outside 12 to 15 does not need widening.
- A lack of parking spaces for Castle Street will have a knock-on effect around the town.
- All of Castle Street should be made residents only.
- More parking spaces should have been proposed instead of wider pavements.
- The requirement for bus stops should be reviewed.
- Previously submitted resident feedback and comments appear to have been ignored.
- The current pavements are fine and do not need to be widened.
- Seating areas by trees will just attract bird droppings.
- Seating areas will only be used in warmer months so during the winter the space will be lost.
- Too few spaces have been allocated for use by residents.
- The paving for the crossings is not suitable.
- Bus stop on east side does not need a shelter and should be public seating instead.

The comments related to the following additional points: -

- A cycle lane should be added to the footpath.
- It will be difficult for the large amount of traffic coming south on Castle Street to turn right without traffic signals.
- Parking spaces should have been provided by Long Garden Walk as suggested.
- Parking bays should be made larger to allow for increase in vehicle size for modern vehicles.

- The loading bays do not seem adequate for Castle Street and should be at least doubled.
- Taxi spaces should be relocated to East Street and not on Castle Street.
- Electric vehicle recharging spaces should be provided.
- Pavement widening outside dentists is not required. –
- Bus stop on west side of Castle Street is not required.
- Loading bay should be moved slightly northwards to avoid conflict with deliveries outside hospitality venues.

Analysis

The decision is to proceed as advertised with the Castle Street proposals.

In terms of the proposed scheme, the design for Castle Street has been devised as a balance between competing interests to deliver the objectives of the FIP, which include improving the quality of place with clean air, healthier lifestyles and less dominance of traffic.

The scheme presented has had previous consultations, which has included an online consultation, four public exhibitions and four virtual reality events during July 2022 and September 2022. The team have reviewed the detailed feedback received through the Commonplace platform, paper surveys, the virtual reality events and any additional email feedback that has been received.

The response to each of the key points raised by respondents and objectors is as follows:

Residents Parking

Feedback to the consultation included a significant number of responses from residents objecting to the removal of capacity for residents to park their cars, as part of an ongoing proposal from the Castle Street Residents Association to convert all parking in Castle Street to residents only parking.

It is acknowledged that as part of enhancing the quality of place with footway widening, seating and greening and improving the setting of the historic buildings, the proposals do result in the net loss of 5 20-minute parking bays, and 12 shared use Residents or 2 hours pay at machine bays primarily in the southern section of Castle Street closest to the rest of the town centre. Whilst the 12 shared use bays will no longer be available to residents, the spaces lost are towards the southern end of Castle Street where there is more retail and hospitality (rather than purely residential) frontage and the number of residents only bays in Castle Street are being maintained. Whilst requiring the overall number of parking spaces to be reduced, the proposals have focussed this on the 20-minute parking bays (all of which are being removed) and the 12 shared use bays on the basis that this parking demand for shoppers and visitors can be accommodated in nearby off-street car parks. This has been done to limit the impact on residents.

In response to the feedback received regarding the request for more residents only parking spaces, Surrey County Council's parking team will review the capacity and occupancy of all the permit holders only and shared use parking spaces in Castle Street after the FIP scheme has been built to determine whether there is a justifiable need for additional permit holders only spaces and if so, where the most feasible location for them would be.

A cycle lane should be added to the footpath.

Preliminary investigations of providing segregated cycling facilities between Long Garden Walk and Park Row indicated this would require a significant loss of parking spaces in addition to that already proposed. Accordingly, this proposal has been discounted, especially in the light of comments objecting to the currently proposed reduction in parking spaces.

It will be difficult for the large amount of traffic coming south on Castle Street to turn right without traffic signals.

A comment and objection were received to the proposed right turn at the bottom of Castle Street as part of making The Borough a two-way street between Castle Street and Downing Street. Similar comments were received as part of respondents and objectors referencing the proposed change in waiting and loading restrictions and traffic management arrangements on The Borough itself. The proposals are aimed at reducing the level of traffic, improve safety and improving air quality (a significant objective of the Farnham OIP) by allowing traffic to access West Street and the nearby Hart Car Parks without circulating around the current town centre gyratory system, thus modifying the proposals has been discounted accordingly.

The traffic from Castle Street, whether turning left or right in future, will still only be giving way to eastbound traffic on The Borough as is currently the case. Furthermore, traffic signals at this location were ruled out due to the desire to minimise additional street clutter and negatively affect the historic street scene as well as the need to set back any signals on Castle Street to allow vehicles to turn into and from The Borough.

Parking bays should be made larger to allow for increase in vehicle size for modern vehicles.

The parking bays proposed are sized in line with current guidance. Making parking bays larger would result in a further overall loss of parking spaces, which is being minimised particularly in the light of feedback from residents.

The loading bays do not seem adequate for Castle Street and should be at least doubled.

The proposed loading bays have been located close to those businesses likely to generate the greatest demand for delivery and servicing activity. A balance in provision for delivery and servicing spaces has been determined, taking account of the desire to improve the sense of place in Castle Street, including providing footway widening, seating and greening.

Taxi spaces should be relocated to East Street and not on Castle Street.

The taxi spaces in Castle Street are being retained to satisfy demand generated by the existing hospitality businesses as well as based on feedback from the Waverley Borough Council Licensing and Environmental Enforcement team.

Electric vehicle recharging spaces should be provided.

The potential provision of electric vehicle parking spaces is being investigated as part of a separate project.

Parking spaces should have been provided by Long Garden Walk as suggested. Pavement widening outside dentists is not required. Bus stop on west side of Castle Street is not required.

A number of comments were received that the northbound bus stop on Castle Street could be removed and the proposed footway widening could be omitted and replaced with residents parking bays. It should be noted that the footway widening is designed in part to create a better passenger waiting environment and improve access for buses at the stop by making it in line with traffic as recommended within the Healthy Streets design guidance.

As part of the objectives of the FIP, which include rapidly reducing carbon emissions and encouraging sustainable travel, removing the bus stop has been discounted due to the negative impact on passengers and likely further discouragement of bus use in Farnham.

A comment was received from the Farnham Society suggesting that the proposed 2 blue badge parking bays and loading pad should be relocated to outside nos. 8, 9, 9a and 10. The 2 blue badge parking bays are being maintained in their current location to provide convenient parking for blue badge users (including those with difficulty walking) close to the core of the town centre at the southern end of Castle Street. The relocation of them further north away from the core of the town centre has been discounted on this basis. The proposed loading pad has been located close to the hospitality businesses on this part of Castle Street, which are likely to generate demand for vehicle servicing and deliveries. Locating the loading pad close to such businesses will help to minimise the dwell time of such vehicles, thus minimising any impact on the street scene of this activity. Furthermore, the loading pad has been located at least partially across the Hamptons Estate Agent frontage where demand for outside seating and the visual impact of delivery vehicles will be less. Relocating the loading pad further north as requested will result in further loss of parking spaces that we are attempting to minimise. For these reasons relocating the loading pad has been discounted.

Farnham – The Borough

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 4
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- A two-way exit at the bottom of Castle Street leading onto The Borough will increase congestion.
- Making part of the Borough two-way, with a right turn at the bottom of Castle Street into the Borough, will increase congestion.

The comments related to the following additional points: -

- This popular bus stop will cause traffic congestion on a two-way road.
- The narrowing of this street should be carried out last.

Analysis

The decision is to proceed as advertised with The Borough proposals.

In terms of the right turn at the bottom of Castle Street, the proposals are aimed at reducing the level of traffic, improve safety and improving air quality (a significant objective of the Farnham OIP) by allowing traffic to access West Street and the nearby Hart Car Parks without circulating around the current town centre gyratory system. Thus, modifying the proposals has been discounted accordingly. The traffic from Castle Street, whether turning left or right in future, will still only be giving way to eastbound traffic on The Borough as is currently the case. Furthermore, traffic signals at this location were ruled out due to the desire to minimise additional street clutter and negatively affect the historic street scene as well as the need to set back any signals on Castle Street to allow vehicles to turn into and from The Borough.

In terms of the bus stop, an alternative design is proposed whereby the bus stop will be in a widened carriageway (6m wide eastbound carriageway with a 3m wide bus stop and a 3m wide westbound carriageway) so that eastbound vehicles can bypass the bus while stopped to prevent congestion behind the bus and associated air quality issues. In this design, the northern footway will be widened to improve conditions for pedestrians and the southern footway will be widened to accommodate a soft landscaping strip with rain gardens to improve the visual amenity of the street, assist with drainage and support improvements to air quality. On the southern side of The Borough, there are no changes to the loading restrictions however loading will take place at the kerb rather than in a loading pad.

Farnham – West Street

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Farnham – Downing Street

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection related to most of the shops being front access only and several on-street delivery facilities are therefore crucial. The junction with West Street needs to be wide enough for two vehicles otherwise vehicles waiting to turn right block vehicles wanting to turn left and the traffic flows back into Downing Street.

Analysis

The decision is to proceed as advertised with the Downing Street proposals.

Regarding delivery facilities, the proposals include two delivery bays on the west side of the street, which will be available during business hours, unlike the current situation that prohibits deliveries and servicing from Downing Street during business hours. Regarding the junction with West Street, this junction will be signal controlled with Downing Street having a dedicated 'green' stage for turns to both West Street and Downing Street.

Farnham – Bear Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 2
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The Farnham Bowls Club on Bear Lane needs parking nearby for visitors with heavy sports equipment.

The comments related to the following additional points: -

- Bear Lane traffic will increase with frustrated drivers unable to drive down Park Row and better signage will be needed on Bear Lane to prevent this.
- Widening the pavement on Woolmead Road would restrict the ability to introduce two-way traffic along Woolmead Road, which would allow East Street to be fully pedestrianised.

Analysis

The decision is to proceed as advertised with the Bear Lane proposals.

The comments regarding Farnham Bowls Club and Park Row are related to the Park Row and High Park Road proposals, which are not being taken forward. Regarding footway widening on Woolmead Road, introducing two-way traffic along Woolmead Road was considered as an option during optioneering. However, this option is not deliverable in the short term as land take would be required to enable Woolmead Road to be made wide enough for two HGVs to pass each other.

Farnham – East Street

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Farnham – South Street

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The comment related to potholes on South Street.

Analysis

The observation regarding the existence of potholes on South Street has been passed on to the relevant team within Surrey County Council. The proposals advertised do not cover resurfacing South Street.

Farnham – Victoria Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Farnham – Union Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Farnham – Longbridge

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The comment related to the following: -

- Pedestrian crossing is needed on Longbridge.

Analysis

The decision is to proceed as advertised with the Longbridge proposals.

A pedestrian crossing on Longbridge is currently beyond the scope of the FIP town centre scheme.

Farnham – Upper Church Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Farnham – Lower Church Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: FIP2023-1, FIP2023-2, and FIP2023-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.