

# Waverley parking review 2020: Decision report

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

## **Contents**

Introduction .....	2
Farnham North division proposals.....	3
Farnham Central division proposals.....	4
Farnham South division proposals .....	9
Haslemere division proposals .....	11
Cranleigh division proposals .....	13
Waverley Eastern Villages division proposals.....	14
Waverley Western Villages division proposals .....	15
Godalming North division proposals.....	17
Godalming South, Milford and Witley division proposals.....	19

## Introduction

The Waverley Parking Review 2020 proposals, which were agreed at Waverley local committee on 13 March 2020, were advertised from 2 October to 30 October 2020. As part of this process, street notices were erected at each location, and notification cards were hand delivered to those properties immediately fronting proposed changes. In addition, a formal notice was published in the Surrey Advertiser and Farnham and Haslemere Herald.

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](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/waverleyparking) Those without access to the internet were asked to write in requesting information be posted to them.

Responses to the advertisement were received via an online form through the webpage above, or by letters being sent to the following address: Waverley Parking Review 2020, 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 75 support responses, 47 comment responses and 56 objections. All these 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.

Please note that all responses to the advertised electric vehicle charging points were considered as part of a separate committee report presented to Waverley Local Committee on [13 November 2020](#), and are not included in this report.

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.

## **Farnham North division proposals**

The county councillor for this division is [Mr Stephen Spence](#).

### **Farnham**

#### **Woodbourne junction with Nutbourne**

##### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 24126
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 2
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

##### **Summary**

The two objections were regarding displacement and parking opposite the junction.

##### **Analysis**

Whilst displacement is often inevitable with parking restrictions, the proposed double yellow lines are of a significant length for a residential street junction and will help to improve the situation. Restrictions opposite the junction were not deemed to be necessary and the priority is the junction itself.

# Farnham Central division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mr Andy MacLeod](#).

## Farnham

### Thorold Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24014
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

Comment questioned why scheme was being proposed in this location.

#### Analysis

The proposal was in response to a petition being received from residents of Thorold Road.

## Stoke Hills

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24014
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

Comment raised concern regarding vehicles being able to park on the road where the double yellow lines have been removed.

#### Analysis

The double yellow lines legally apply to the entire width of the adjacent public highway, therefore they have to be removed to allow parking to take place off street. As there are dropped kerbs where the double yellow lines are being removed, vehicles cannot park in front of those dropped kerbs and this can be enforced through the issuing of penalty charge notices.

## Long Garden Walk

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24017
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objection sought clarification on the proposals and stated being against any spaces being taken away.

#### Analysis

As the proposal is to reduce a bay but to provide another new bay, no space is being lost in the street.

## Falkner Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24023
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## Crosby Way

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24027
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## St Georges Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24029
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## Longley Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24029
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## Summary

Two objections from permit holding residents of Tilford Road using Longley Road to park when permit spaces near their properties are unavailable. The comment expressed support for what was being proposed but requested monitoring to ensure it is working long term.

## Analysis

It is understood why some residents of Tilford Road would use Longley Road to park, and that can continue in the time limited parking bays and on the single yellow lines when not in operation. Those wishing to park all day or longer will need to park in a permit holder only or shared use permit bay, and it is believed that there are sufficient numbers of 'B' permit holder signed bays in the vicinity of Tilford Road available for use when Tilford Road bays are full. In addition to 'permit holder only' bays on Tilford Road, Morley Road (part) and St George's Road, there are extensive shared use bays on Alfred Road and further shared use bays on Tilford Road to the north of Alfred Road. However, as part of the next Waverley parking review, we will assess whether additional 'permit holder only' bays are both necessary and possible in this part of Farnham, in response to these raised concerns.

## Menin Way

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24030
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The comment expressed support for what was being proposed but requested monitoring to ensure it is working long term.

### Analysis

As with all parking restrictions, they remain under constant review and monitoring.

## Lynch Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24112
- Objections: 4
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed with amendments.

### Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Restrictions previously proposed outside 9 and 11 Lynch Road not being included.
- Double yellow lines not being proposed outside 12 Monkshanger on Lynch Road.
- Restrictions proposed outside 49 Lynch Road requested to apply 8am and 6pm.
- Bay proposed opposite number 70 will restrict access to residential driveway.

The comment expressed support for what was being proposed but requested monitoring to ensure it is working long term.

### Analysis

The restrictions advertised outside 9 and 11 Lynch Road as part of the 2018 parking review were dropped following objections over the 10 to 11am curfew period. During the 2020 parking review when a different curfew period was being considered, it was thought that there was a sufficient amount of this new curfew period being proposed in Longley Road, Menin Way and Lynch Road in the vicinity of Monkshanger to meet demand, and that additional restrictions outside 9 and 11 Lynch Road were not deemed to be necessary or a priority for this review. However, the use of the curfew restriction and this location will remain under review.

The double yellow lines proposed on the junction with Monkshanger, which are partly outside number 12, are deemed to be sufficient enough to maintain access, sight lines and road safety on the junction.

The curfew restriction proposed outside 49 Lynch Road is necessary to allow parking by those local to the area, including staff from the nearby hospice. A longer restriction period is not suitable as it will prevent this parking from taking place.

The 20m 4 hour limited waiting bay proposed opposite number 70 **will be amended** so that it is 5m shorter from its western end, and the proposed double yellow lines will extend up to this reduced bay of 15m. This will help maintain access to the narrow driveway located opposite the bay.

## Red Lion Lane

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24129
- Objections: 6
- Comments: 1
- Support: 30
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- As many properties have off street parking, the whole cost of the scheme will need to be covered by those without off street parking.
- Having to pay for permits to stop other people parking is unfair.
- Parking in Red Lion Lane is not as bad as it's made out to be.
- Residents with more cars than permits allow for will have to park elsewhere.
- The scheme is unfair between those with and without off street parking.
- All properties should be entitled to the same number of permits regardless of their off-street parking situation.
- The turning circle has not been included in the scheme.
- Scheme will be abused by those non-residents willing to risk the occasional fine.

The comment stated that the permit scheme times of Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm are inadequate as non-resident parking takes place in the evenings and on Sundays. The scheme should therefore be 24/7.

### Analysis

The 6 objections represented 5 Red Lion Lane households.

Permit costs for resident parking schemes are the same across the county, as part of Surrey's parking strategy. Whilst it is understood that residents with no or limited off street parking are the ones who contribute the most in terms of having to pay for permits, these are the residents who see the most benefit from permit schemes and are ultimately why resident permit schemes exist. Those with adequate off-street parking and no need for resident permits may still often require visitor permits, which also come at a cost. As the cost of permits remains the same regardless of how many properties there are or how many permits have been sold in the street, the overall cost is not burdened upon those properties who require resident permits.

Whilst some residents believe that having to pay to stop non-residents parking is unfair, permit schemes should not be funded by the general taxpayer, which is why there are costs for the residents who require such schemes.

With regards to the requirement of permit parking in Red Lion Lane, this proposed scheme was made in response to a petition signed by the majority of Red Lion Lane residents requesting permit parking. Whilst some residents believe that the parking situation is not as bad as it is made out to be, this does not seem to be the view of the majority of residents in the street.

All permit schemes in Farnham operate with the same criteria, with limits on the number of permits available. Whilst there will sometimes be cases where a household has too many cars for what the criteria allows permits for, the criteria is in place to ensure fair usage of on-street parking where it is so limited in availability. During the times the scheme operates, resident vehicles without permits will need to park elsewhere to avoid receiving a penalty charge notice. The allocation of permits based on off-street parking provision is deemed to be fair to the street as a whole, as it keeps on-street space primarily for those who need it most.

Regarding the turning head at the far end of Red Lion Lane, as stated in the Frequently Asked Questions document delivered to residents during the advertisement stage, this has been confirmed

as being public highway and will be included in the permit scheme. The scheme boundary line shown on the map will be corrected.

Regarding the permit scheme operation times, these reflect the Farnham town centre controlled parking zone times and are considered most suitable for this street, being just outside this zone. No permit schemes in Waverley operate 24/7 as they are based around normal enforcement times as much as possible.

Considering the objections received are from 5 Red Lion Lane households, it must be assumed that the majority of households are in favour of the scheme as advertised and it should therefore proceed as advertised.



# Farnham South division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mr Wyatt Ramsdale](#).

## Farnham

### Riverdale junction with Wrecclesham Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24036
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 5
- Support: 5
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections related the following: -

- The road is useful to the area in terms of available parking space.
- The restrictions would displace the parking further into the road.
- The restrictions do not go far enough and are needed up to Dale Close.
- Restrictions are needed on the other junction with the A325 as well.

#### Analysis

The advertised proposal was in response to a 116 signature petition being submitted to the council, requesting double yellow lines on the junction with Wrecclesham Road up to the first dropped kerbs in Riverdale only. This is what was subsequently agreed and advertised as part of this review.

Whilst it is understood that some residents wish the restrictions to extend further, the petition was very clear in its request, and had support from the majority of residents. Additional restrictions can only now be considered as part of the next parking review of Waverley. Regarding parking space being removed, parking on a junction should never be viewed or treated as being parking space, as it is prohibited under the highway code and is highly obstructive to sight lines, road safety and traffic flow.

### Swingate Road junction with Vicarage Hill

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24143
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 2
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed with amendments.

#### Summary

Comments and objections relate to cars moving to the opposite side; that the restrictions do not go far enough; and that restrictions are needed opposite the junction as well.

#### Analysis

The potential for vehicles to displace to the south side is certainly possible, and taking into account the south side opposite the advertised restrictions is partly on, and on approach to the inside of a bend, this displaced parking could possibly result in more significant issues with traffic flow and sight lines than exist currently. Whilst it was the intention to assess the advertised restrictions to determine whether any displacement parking took place on the opposite side, it is felt that the concerns raised in this feedback should be upheld. The advertised double yellow lines **will be amended** so that they terminate at a point 15m from the junction with Swingate Road only. This will maintain sight lines on the junction, whilst still allowing some parking to take place after this point on

the north side, reducing the likelihood of displacement to the south side. The restrictions will be reviewed as part of the next parking review of Waverley to determine their effectiveness and whether additional restrictions are needed, for both the north and the south side together.

## Haslemere division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mrs Nikki Barton](#).

### Haslemere

#### Tanners Lane

##### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24053
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Lower Street

##### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24054
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Fieldway

##### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24055
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Lion Mead

##### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24056
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### King's Road

##### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24058
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## **Hedgehog Lane**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 24058
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 8
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

# Cranleigh division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Dr Andrew Povey](#).

## Cranleigh

### St Nicholas Avenue

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24103
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

# Waverley Eastern Villages division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mrs Victoria Young](#).

## Wonersh

### Wonersh Common

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24134
- Objections: 3
- Comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections related to the parking being helpful in reducing traffic speeds and possible issues with lack of enforcement.

#### Analysis

As on street parking will continue to take place in between the dropped kerbs from south of the Memorial Hall to the junction with The Street, the removal of the small amount of on-street parking taking place to the north of the Memorial Hall will have little impact on vehicle speeds along this road. Parked cars cannot and should not be relied upon as a type of traffic calming measure, as the number and duration of parked cars varies. Sight lines for vehicles exiting the Memorial Hall were deemed to be the priority on this specific part of Wonersh Common, as well as maintaining two-way traffic flow in the vicinity of the hall.

### Barnett Lane junction with The Street and Cranleigh Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24134
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

Comment regarding displacement of parked cars to other hazardous parts of highway.

#### Analysis

The proposed double yellow lines are deemed to be sufficient to resolve the reported problems here with access, and they will remain under review for possible additions if necessary, as part of future parking reviews of Waverley.

# Waverley Western Villages division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mr David Harmer](#).

## Hindhead

### Beacon Hill Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24044
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## Churt

### Jumps Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24153
- Objections: 28
- Comments: 26
- Support: 12
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections (and comments) related to the following: -

- Double yellow lines being proposed are where cars do not park anyway.
- A rural clearway is needed instead, as concluded in the iTransport report.
- The double yellow lines proposed are inadequate to solve the problem.
- The Sculpture Park should increase their off-street parking provision.
- Park cars will displace further along the road or to other streets.
- Parking will be compacted to the north side, reducing road width.
- Double yellow lines are not suitable for this area and are unsightly.
- More extensive double yellow lines should be introduced on both sides.
- The proposed double yellow lines will make the situation worse.
- The north side of bend is still dangerous and should be restricted as well.

#### Analysis

The assessed complaints regarding parking in Jumps Road mentioned that whilst the number of parked cars on-street varies, congestion and access was a particular concern when it takes place on both sides of the road. The information submitted to the parking team from Frensham and Churt parish councils also contained several photographs highlighting the parking on both sides restricting the road to a single lane.

As mentioned in the committee report, Jumps Road is not ideal for lining due its rural nature, with the north side being far from ideal. Being able to physically install road markings is something considered during parking reviews as it is the final stage of the process. Therefore, there were limitations on the extent of restrictions which could be proposed.

As with any bend, the inside of the bend (the shortest curve) is the most obstructive for sight lines, and ultimately the most hazardous side to park on. Whilst parking on the outside of the bend is certainly not ideal, its impact is not as severe as when on the inside. The inside of the bend in Jumps Road is on the south side, and the side most suitable for lining. As displacement parking is

always considered, the 190m extent of proposed double yellow lines continues for quite some distance south of the bend itself, in order to keep cars parked on the north side only, until the vicinity of the bend is completely cleared.

Parking directly outside the Sculpture park's entrance on flattened ground takes place without encroaching onto the asphalt carriageway, so that was not deemed to be affecting traffic flow or sight lines in terms of the few cars parking in that way. However, it is understood that additional parking in large numbers away from this entrance area does start to encroach onto the asphalt carriageway, reducing the width for traffic to pass each other. However, with the inside of the bend significantly protected, this was believed to be the priority proposal to make as part of this review, as it will help to mitigate the impact of the overall parking in this part of Jumps Road.

Bacon Lane and Priory Lane, where rural clearways (no stopping restrictions) were previously introduced, have significantly harder rural extents of their carriageways, meaning vehicles need to be parked almost entirely on the asphalt surface, which is what has led to those roads being completely blocked to the point where no one can physically get past in some situations. However, Jumps Road has a much softer rural extent of its carriageway, meaning vehicles can drive and park partly over its flattened extents if they need to. Therefore, stopping all parking entirely, in the form of a clearway restriction, was not deemed to be necessary at this stage, or best for the area as a whole. A clearway would effectively create close to 100% displacement of all parked vehicles, and as the wider area is completely unrestricted, there is no limit to where vehicles could displace to, and there are many locations nearby that are potentially more hazardous for parking should it begin where it has never been before.

The iTransport report, privately commissioned by residents to assess the parking on Jumps Road, was submitted to the parking team in early March 2020. This report primarily compared the difference between our proposal to double yellow line part of Jumps Road with the Parish council's preference for a clearway to be introduced. Whilst it is understood how the report simply concluded that no parking at all would be best for traffic flow and sight lines, it didn't take displacement parking into account at all, and the question of 'where people will go instead' is something we always have to consider when proposing parking restrictions.

Despite the large number of objections and comments received, it is still believed that the advertised double yellow lines will see an improvement in the parking situation in the vicinity of the Sculpture park. As with any introduced parking restrictions in Surrey, they remain under review, and there will be opportunities as part of future parking reviews of the borough to consider whether additional restrictions are necessary, following assessments of the effectiveness of the advertised restrictions. To reduce the visual impact of having yellow lines in this rural area for the first time, narrow primrose yellow lines will be installed.



# Godalming North division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mrs Penny Rivers](#).

## Godalming

### Douglas Drive junction with Catteshall Lane

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24079
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## South Hill

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24145
- Objections: 6
- Comments: 3
- Support: 5
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

2 objections (from one household) referring to the advertised double yellow line extension outside 76/77 related to the following: -

- Extension of restrictions not necessary to resolve sight lines.
- Overhanging vegetations should be cut back.
- 20pmh speed limits should be introduced instead to improve safety in the area.
- Current construction site by location is making situation worse.
- Extensions of restrictions will mean drivers take less care negotiating the corner.

4 objections to the permit scheme related to the following: -

- Residents in permit area have garages which they don't use.
- Scheme will cause displacement to other parts of South Hill.
- Do not want to pay to park outside own property.
- Road not wide enough to allow permit parking on both sides.
- Property with steep driveway too difficult to use so would require more permits.

3 comments referred to questions regarding permit allocation and off-street parking space; concerns regarding displacement to other parts of South Hill; and request for scheme to be extended further to maintain traffic flow for refuse collection vehicles and others.

#### Analysis

The proposed extension of **double yellow lines** outside 76/77 is necessary to maintain sight lines and two-way traffic flow on approach to this inside of the bend, which is always the most hazardous side of a bend and is also quite a sharp bend in this case. The removal of 2 car lengths here will significantly improve sight lines, traffic flow and road safety, as vehicles exiting South Hill be on the correct side of the road travelling around this bend and will be able to see oncoming traffic more clearly in advance. Likewise, for vehicles entering South Hill, they will be able to see oncoming traffic and will not have to negotiate oncoming traffic encroaching heavily into their lane. It is understood that the construction site is creating additional parking and traffic flow issues in this area, but this addressed situation on the bend is a long-term issue.

The proposed **permit scheme** is to provide permit parking in the part of South Hill which needs it the most, and follows a petition from these residents showing majority support. Whilst it is understood that these properties have access to garages, it is also understood that garage blocks constructed several decades ago are often not suitable for modern sized cars. Whilst parking can take place in front of the garages, this does not cater for all the parking demand in this part of South Hill. The preference to park closer to your property is understandable too, especially considering many of the properties without off street parking are located at the bottom of steep steps, already presenting a challenge for transporting goods etc, particularly for more vulnerable residents.

Whilst displacement to other parts of South Hill is likely, the most hazardous parts of South Hill have already been protected with extensive double yellow lines, and therefore this displacement will be managed as best as possible by these existing restrictions. The vast majority of properties in the remaining parts of South Hill have adequate parking with no need to park on-street, and the few other properties without off-street parking are in locations that are not as densely populated as those within the advertised permit scheme area.

Whilst some residents believe that having to pay to stop non-residents parking is unfair, permit schemes should not be funded by the general taxpayer, which is why there are costs for the residents who require such schemes.

A 'permit holders only past this point' scheme operates with entry signs only and no marked bays on the ground. Therefore, permit holders can park anywhere on street within the scheme area, provided they are not blocking someone else's dropped kerb or parked hazardously or obstructively. With a residents' only area, the overall parking on-street will be reduced, resulting in improved traffic flow and access than previously.

Properties with driveways or off-street parking that the residents consider not useable will be considered when permits are applied for, as the property and its off-street parking is assessed during this application stage conducted by Guildford Borough Council. As mentioned above, we are aware many old garages are not suitable for modern sized cars and that some driveways here are very steep.

Considering that only 3 of the 4 objections came from South Hill households located within the permit scheme, it must be assumed that the majority of South Hill residents located within the permit scheme are in favour of the advertised scheme. Therefore, it should proceed as advertised.

## **Nightingale Road**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 24146
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## **32 Holloway Hill**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: No Drawing
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

# Godalming South, Milford and Witley division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mr Peter Martin](#).

## Milford

### New Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24068
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

#### Summary

The comment response was primarily with regards to that the parking situation has changed since these proposals were made. The music works and its associated on-street parking has relocated to Rodborough School and the building is now for use by The Grail Message Association. The Rodborough Common car park charges being dropped will mean no further displacement parking in New Road. The parking is useful to residents of the street and their visitors.

#### Analysis

In light of these significant changes affecting the parking situation in this particular part of New Road, it is deemed best at this stage not to proceed with the advertised proposal and for the parking situation to be assessed again as part of the next parking review of Waverley.

## Wormley

### Brook Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 24135
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

Comment and support responses request further, and extended restrictions be introduced.

#### Analysis

The two proposed additional lengths of double yellow lines were all that were deemed necessary to resolve the reported issues prior to the review taking place. It is also taken into consideration that whenever introducing new restrictions in this street, there is the potential for on-street parking to be squeezed to a point where it begins to take place on opposite sides to where currently, or in places likely to cause more significant problems elsewhere in the street. Therefore, the proposals in Brook Road, both past and present, always try to create a balance between resolving an issue and allowing parking to continue similarly to where it has been. The advertised restrictions will be monitored to see how effective they have been and whether any further restrictions are necessary as part of the next parking review of Waverley.

## **Godalming**

### **Ockford Ridge**

#### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 24148
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Park Road junction with The Drive and Busbridge Lane**

#### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 24149
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.