

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD).****DATE: TUESDAY 8 DECEMBER 2015****LEAD OFFICER: KEVIN MCKEE, PARKING SERVICES MANAGER, GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL****SUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW – PROPOSALS FOR GEOGRAPHIC AREAS AND ‘AD-HOC’ LOCATIONS****DIVISION(S): ALL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report presents the feedback from further informal consultation undertaken in the Burpham shopping parade area including Burpham Lane. The report also reports representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals in a number of other geographic areas and ‘ad-hoc’ locations. The report recommends proposals for Burpham and a number of other ‘ad-hoc’ locations are progressed to formal advertisement to seek comments, and that traffic regulation orders are made in a number of other ‘ad-hoc’ locations that already been formally advertised.

RECOMMENDATIONS:**The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree:**

- (i) to formally advertise the proposals for the Burpham shopping parade area including Burpham Lane, shown in ANNEXE 2, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made.
- (ii) to formally advertise the proposals for Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham) and School Lane (Pirbright), shown in ANNEXE 3, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made.
- (iii) that possible proposals for Ockham Road North (East Horsley) are not progressed, following discussions with the local borough and county councillors, Surrey Police and East and West Horsley Parish Councils.
- (iv) to defer consideration of the geographic review items covering Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford, and those ‘ad-hoc’ items which have generated a ‘substantial’ number of representations, listed in ANNEXE 4, to the March 2016 meeting of the committee, to allow for further discussions with local borough and county councillors and other interested parties.

- (v) that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made to implement new controls and changes to the existing in the 'ad-hoc' locations as shown in ANNEXE 6.
- (vi) to formally advertise the proposals for Friars Gate, High Street (Ripley), Millmead Terrace, New Cross Road, Ward Street and Woking Road, listed in ANNEXE 7, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made.
- (vii) to correct Minute 85/15 associated with Item 15 which was presented to the 17 June 2015 meeting of the Local Committee, and subsequently ratified at the Committee's 30 September 2015 meeting, to the version that appears within ANNEXE 8 of this report, as it has subsequently been raised that the minute was incorrect.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To assist with safety, access, traffic movements, increase the availability of space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities, and to make local improvements.

To correct an error in the minutes to a previous meeting that has only recently become apparent.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 When the scope of the present parking review was determined, the Committee agreed to undertake informal consultations in six geographic areas. These are the Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford.
- 1.2 As part of the current review, it was also agreed to develop proposals in a number of 'ad-hoc' locations. Of the 250 locations we have assessed we have progressed around 20. Furthermore, the review includes changes to accommodate disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and access arrangements for new developments.
- 1.3 Previously, the Committee agreed to conduct further informal consultation in Burpham shopping parade area including Burpham Lane. During October 2015 a further consultation, including public exhibitions, was undertaken.
- 1.4 Furthermore, the Committee also agreed to formally advertise proposals in the Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford. It also agreed to formally advertise the 20 or so 'ad-hoc' changes, and those associated with disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and access arrangements for new developments. In total, this involved 90 different roads.
- 1.5 Previously, the Committee also agreed that further informal discussions take place with the local ward and divisional councillors, and other interested

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose an item.](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose%20an%20item)

parties, in respect to possible proposals for Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham) and Ockham Road North (East Horsley), and that these are reported to a future meeting of the Committee, to seek authority to formally advertise them.

- 1.6 During the course of the review, the need has arisen to accommodate new vehicle crossovers, improve existing accesses, those associated with developments and various changes to accompany highway initiatives.
- 1.7 This report summarises the feedback received as a result of both the informal and formal consultations and recommends the next steps.

2. ANALYSIS:

Burpham shopping parade area including Burpham Lane

- 2.1 The consultation took place between 9 October and 6 November 2014. We wrote directly to around 450 addresses in 14 roads, as well as the Burpham Community Association and the Burpham Neighbourhood Forum. Six of the roads consulted are private. The letter invited them to attend two public exhibitions that were held at Sutherland Memorial Hall on 17 and 22 October. Street notices were also erected to publicise the exhibitions. The letter and street notices also provided links to the Borough and County Councils' websites. This gave those that were unable to attend exhibitions an opportunity to view the proposals, supporting documentation and submit comments online.
- 2.2 Overall, around 136 people attended the two exhibitions. The page on the Borough Council's website received over 550 'hits'. 85 responses were received. 51 of these were received from those contacted directly (26 from Burpham Lane). Therefore, around 11% of addresses written to responded. However, 14 responses came from people who did not provide address details. Conceivably, we may have written directly to some of these. Almost 70% of the feedback was submitted online. A table summarising the feedback appears in ANNEXE 1.
- 2.3 62 respondents commented about Burpham Lane. 30 commented about Kingpost Parade / London Parade / Barton Place (shopping parade). 14 commented about Burnet Avenue, 10 about Marlins Drive and 4 about New Inn Lane.

Burpham Lane

- 2.4 Of the 62 respondents that commented about Burpham Lane, around two-thirds either fully or tended to support the draft proposals.
- 2.5 However, in the section of Burpham Lane between London Road and the 90-degree bend, concerns were raised about the loss of space for those using the nursery and the bridge club at the Cricket Pavilion and attending Burpham Village Hall. However, in the small number of locations where we were intending to retain parking, away from junctions and accesses, concerns were raised about the presence and positioning of these uncontrolled sections.
- 2.6 In the section of Burpham Lane between the 90-degree bend and Clay Lane, concerns were raised about the loss of space for the small number of

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose an item](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose%20an%20item).

households that do not access to off-street parking. The loss of facility for those attending the church were also raised.

- 2.7 In the cul-de-sac section of Burpham Lane, outside Burpham Primary School, issues associated with the school run featured prominently. Some suggested that the turning facility at cul-de-sac end, which also serves as the main vehicular access to the school, should be better protected.
- 2.8 Displacement into the adjacent roads was also a concern. Other highway-related concerns included the speed and volume of traffic and the road's use as a 'rat-run'. Some suggested that the proposed controls would cause greater issues.
- 2.9 It is also worth noting that during the course of the consultation the County Council introduced controls in Burpham Lane associated with the Aldi store development. The potential impact that the store and these controls would have featured heavily within the feedback.

Shopping parade

- 2.10 Of the 30 respondents that commented about the shopping parade, over 70% either fully or tended to support the draft proposals.
- 2.11 However, concerns were raised that the 3-hour limited waiting period would be too long and would be open to abuse. Some suggested that a shorter period was more appropriate. The 3-hour limit has been chosen to service the wide variety of retail businesses present, including a restaurant and ladies hairdresser.
- 2.12 Unfortunately, the Kingpost Parade Management Company did not confirm how they envisaged managing the private area for which they are responsible. The area that they manage currently has a maximum period of stay of 1 hour, although it is believed that it is managed informally.
- 2.13 Nevertheless, the 1-hour limit provided in their area, combined with the 3-hour limit we are proposing should provide a range of parking opportunities for visitors to the parade.
- 2.14 Some respondents also suggested that the operational hours of the controls within the parade should extend up until 9pm. At this time, only a few of the businesses are open. A greater number of those that live above the shops are also at home.
- 2.15 The Barton Place Management Company are in dispute with the County Council regarding the status of Barton Place and whether or not it is public highway. Obviously, if it is subsequently established that Barton Place is private, then the parking proposals for this area will not be progressed.

Burnet Avenue

- 2.16 Of the 14 respondents that commented about Burnet Avenue, around 85% tended to support the draft proposals.
- 2.17 However, there were concerns that the controls within the road were not extensive enough. Particular concerns was expressed about the protection proposed around the road's junction with New Inn Lane. The impact parked

vehicles have on the ability to cross the road using the footway on the south-west side of New Inn Lane also featured prominently.

Marlyns Drive

2.18 Of the 10 respondents that commented about Marlyns Drive, 50% tended to support the draft proposals.

2.19 A major concerns was the potential for parking to displace into the road, and beyond, if the proposals in Burpham Lane were introduced. It was also suggested that the protection proposed around the road's junction with Burpham Lane would be insufficient.

New Inn Lane

2.20 Of the 4 respondents that commented on New Inn Lane, all either fully supported or tended to support the draft proposals.

2.21 The retention of some unrestricted areas in the section between London Road and Burnet Avenue was welcomed by some. However, others felt that if these lengths were not controlled that issues similar to those experienced in Burpham Lane could arise, particularly if the area became subject to displacement.

Other Roads

2.22 A number of other roads, where controls are not being proposed, were referred to by respondents. Several were raised by the Burpham Community Association on behalf of its members. Otherwise, the Community Association were generally supportive of the proposals.

2.23 We have presented the feedback about the draft proposals to the local borough and county councillors. The proposals have been revised as a result.

2.24 The major changes from those consulted upon at the exhibitions are:

- Burnet Avenue: extension of the double yellow lines at its junction with New Inn Lane,
- Burpham Lane (London Road – bend): the removal of all unrestricted areas, and the disabled bay outside the village hall, all being replaced by double yellow lines,
- Burpham Lane (bend – Clay Lane): downgrading of the proposed double yellow lines protecting the pedestrian crossing point between the memorial park and the church to single yellow lines,
- Burpham Lane (cul-de-sac): introduction of double yellow lines to protect the turning facility,
- Howard Ridge: introduction of additional single and double yellow lines within its length, rather than just double yellow lines at its junction with Burpham Lane,
- Marlyns Drive: extension of the double yellow lines at its junction with Burpham Lane,
- New Inn Lane (London Road – Burnet Avenue): the removal of all unrestricted areas, all being replaced by double yellow lines.

- The proposals for the shopping parade remain unchanged. However, if evidence comes to light that suggests Barton Place is not public highway, then this element of the proposals can be dropped.

2.25 The proposals recommended for formal advertisement appear in ANNEXE 2.

Proposals for Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham), Ockham Road North (East Horsley) and School Lane (Pirbright)

- 2.26 The proposals in the above locations are primarily associated with the issues around schools. At the June meeting of the Committee, it was decided to defer formal advertisement of the proposals to allow for further informal discussion to take place.
- 2.27 Following the June meeting, officers met with local borough and county councillors and other interested parties to discuss further the draft proposals that had been developed previously. In some cases, this involved meetings on site.
- 2.28 The draft proposals in some of the locations have been amended as a result of these discussions. In the case of the proposal for Ockham Road North (East Horsley), it is recommended not to proceed with any measures. In this particular case, although there was evidence of issues previously, currently there would seem to be little or no parking problems. Although there are occasionally issues caused by queuing traffic turning into the Glenesk School's car park, these issues would not be resolved through the introduction of formalised parking controls.
- 2.29 The proposals recommended for formal advertisement for Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham) and School Lane (Pirbright) appear in ANNEXE 3.

Formally advertised proposals - various

- 2.30 The formal advertisement of proposals took place between 30 October and 20 November 2015. The proposals involved 90 roads. These encompassed five of the six geographic areas (the Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford), 20 or so 'ad-hoc' locations, and a number of others where changes were necessary to accommodate disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and new developments.
- 2.31 We wrote directly to over 4,700 addresses. A public notice was also published in the Surrey Advertiser newspaper and on the public-notices.co.uk website. Additionally, over 500 street notices were erected in and around the proposed locations. The legal notices and supporting documentation were made available to view at all four deposit centres within the borough. The letter and street notices provided links to the Borough and County Councils' websites. This gave those that were unable to visit the deposit centres an opportunity to view the proposals, supporting documentation and submit comments online.
- 2.32 The page on the Borough Council's website received nearly 5,800 'hits'. Overall, 381 representations were received. Almost 85% of the representations were submitted online. The vast majority of the proposals received representations. Some of the representations referred to proposals in

more than one road. In total 446 location-specific references to proposals were made. A table summarising the representations appears in ANNEXE 4.

2.33 Because of the number of representations received, and the nature of the issues raised by some of those making representations, it is recommended that only those locations with no, few or wholly supportive representations are considered within this report. These locations are:

- Spiceall, Compton
- Guildford Road (service road), Effingham,
- Agraria Road, Guildford,
- Cline Road, Guildford,
- Cranley Road, Guildford,
- Ellis Avenue, Guildford,
- Falcon Road, Guildford,
- Josephs Road, Guildford,
- Makenfield Road, Guildford,
- Pewley Hill, Guildford,
- Tormead Road, Guildford,
- Aldershot Road (services road), Guildford,
- Barrack Road, Guildford,
- Manor Road, Guildford,
- Sandy Lane, Send
- Send Road (including service road), Send
- Tannery Lane, Send

2.34 The detail of the representations, and officer comments and recommendation associated with these proposals appears in ANNEXE 5.

2.35 The proposals for which it is recommended that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made to implement new controls and changes to the existing in the 'ad-hoc' locations as shown in ANNEXE 6. Please note that these encompass all the locations listed in 2.33, with the exception of Markenfield Road, Guildford. During the course of the consultation, it became apparent that the person for which the disabled bay was being proposed had moved away. The only other revision to the proposals originally advertised relates to Tannery Lane, where it is now recommended that lesser controls are introduced.

2.36 For the remainder of the locations, it is recommended that consideration is deferred to the March 2016 meeting of the committee, to allow for further discussions with local borough and county councillors and other interested parties. This involves the geographic review items covering Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford, and those 'ad-hoc' items which have generated a 'substantial' number of representations. These locations are identified in ANNEXE 4.

Additional locations recommended for formal advertisement

2.37 During the course of the review, a small number of other issues have arisen. These relate to:

- the creation of a new vehicle crossover (No.4 Friars Gate, Guildford),
- improvements to access to existing facilities (No.49a New Cross Road and No.4 Ward Street, Guildford),
- changes to accommodate accesses associated with new developments (Millmead Terrace, Guildford),
- improved turn-over of space within time limited bays (High Street, Ripley),
- changes to accompany highway initiatives (Woking Road, Weyfield),
- ensuring the traffic regulation order accurately reflects the restrictions present (various, New Cross Road).

2.38 In relation to the proposal for High Street (Ripley), Parking Services was approached by Ripley Parish Council. It was concerned about the misuse of the limited waiting spaces within the village. It is suggested that some motorists are able to 'shuffle their vehicles' without leaving the parking space for the required period. The introduction of a longer no return period, increasing the existing 1 hour to 4 hours, will reduce the opportunities for motorists to misuse the 2 hour limited waiting spaces.

2.39 A list of the additional locations recommended for formal advertisement appears in ANNEXE 7.

3. OPTIONS:

3.1 The Committee needs to decide whether to advertise the proposals as recommended, make changes, or not to progress some, or all of the proposals. After a proposal is advertised any comments or objections received would be reported to the Committee and a decision taken whether to implement the proposals, or implement less restrictive proposals. If there was a wish to increase the amount of restriction as a result of comments received, the proposals would have to be advertised again. The recommended proposals have been discussed, and in some cases have already been amended, as a result of the discussions with local borough and county councillors.

3.2 If the Committee agrees the recommendations, it is likely that the formal advertisement will take place in early 2016. The intention would be to report any subsequently received representations to the June 2016 meeting of the Committee.

3.3 The Committee could choose not to formally advertise the proposals and make the orders. However, the issues that have been raised, and in many cases confirmed by the consultations, would remain unresolved.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Letters associated with the informal and formal consultations have been distributed to over 5,000 addresses, various other interested parties such as parish council, community organisations and residents' associations. This has resulted in over 6,000 'hits' on the associated pages on the Borough Council's website. In the case of the formal consultations, statutory consultees have also been notified.
- 4.2 The feedback and proposals have been circulated to relevant local borough and county councillors.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 We anticipate that the overall cost of the current review will not be more than £50,000 and this can be met from on-street parking surplus. This figure covers both the geographic and ad-hoc elements of the review. The precise amount will ultimately depend on the number of locations where we subsequently introduce controls.
- 5.2 Existing resources will be used to conduct the consultations and the only additional expenditure will be postage.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Blue badge holders can park in disabled parking bays without time limit or on yellow lines, not subject to loading restrictions, for up to three hours and are exempt from charges for parking on-street. They can also park for an unlimited period in residents only, shared-use or limited waiting parking places.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The proposals will affect all road users in the areas where amendments are proposed and particularly residents. The proposals will be publicised and the comments received given carefully considered.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.

Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report
---------------	--

Sustainability implications

- 8.1 Parking sits alongside Climate Change and Air Quality within the strategies that feed into the Surrey Transport Plan. Therefore, in many respects, these strategies and sustainability are inter-dependant.
- 8.2 Preventing parking in locations where it would otherwise cause safety and access issues, and in particular, impede traffic, helps reduce congestion, the resultant journey times and pollution. This can be particularly important on bus routes and where large vehicles utilise relatively narrow roads.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 We have carefully considered the feedback received and recommend the Committee agrees:
 - (i) to formally advertise the proposals for the Burpham shopping parade area including Burpham Lane, shown in ANNEXE 2, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made,
 - (ii) to formally advertise the proposals for Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham) and School Lane (Pirbright), shown in ANNEXE 3, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made,
 - (iii) that possible proposals for Ockham Road North (East Horsley) are not progressed, following discussions with the local borough and county councillors, Surrey Police and East and West Horsley Parish Councils,
 - (iv) to defer consideration of the geographic review items covering Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford, and those 'ad-hoc' items which have generated a 'substantial' number of representations, listed in ANNEXE 4, to the March 2016 meeting of the committee, to allow for further discussions with local borough and county councillors and other interested parties,
 - (v) that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made to implement new controls and changes to the existing in the 'ad-hoc' locations as shown in ANNEXE 6,
 - (vi) to formally advertise the proposals for Friars Gate, High Street (Ripley), Millmead Terrace, New Cross Road, Ward Street and Woking Road, listed in ANNEXE 7, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for

consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made,

- (vii) to correct Minute 85/15 associated with Item 15, which was presented to the 17 June 2015 meeting of the Local Committee, and subsequently ratified at the Committee's 30 September 2015 meeting, to the version that appears within ANNEXE 8 of this report, as it has subsequently been raised that the minute was incorrect.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to formally advertise the proposals set out in recommendations (i), (ii) and (vi), it is likely that this will take place early in 2016. This would involve publishing a public notice, erecting street notices, placing documentation on deposit and writing to those in the immediate vicinity of the proposals. The intention would be to report any subsequently received representations to the June 2016 meeting of the Committee. If we were to subsequently implement any controls, this is expected to take place in mid-to-late 2016.
- 10.2 If the Committee agrees recommendation (iv) officers will collate the remainder of representations that are not being considered in detail within this report and will meet with local borough and county councillors and other interested parties to discuss them. This will include the geographic review items covering Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, Effingham Junction, Fairlands, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford, and those 'ad-hoc' items which have generated a 'substantial' number of representations. The outcome of these discussions will be reported to the March 2016 meeting of the Committee with recommendations. If we were to subsequently implement any controls, this is expected to take place in mid-2016.
- 10.3 If the Committee agrees recommendation (v), officers will make the Traffic Regulation Orders. However, rather than making the order in part, and having to advertise our intention to do so separately from the other proposals already formally advertised, we anticipate making one order to cover all the proposals advertised thus far. It is likely that this will result in all the proposals, barring those yet to be formally advertised, being introduced in one phase, in mid-2016.

Contact Officer:

Andrew Harkin, On-street Parking Coordinator, Guildford Borough Council
(01483) 444535

Consulted:

Surrey Police and other statutory consultees
Residents
Businesses
Community groups and residents' associations
Parish Councils

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose an item](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose%20an%20item).

Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

- 1 - Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane – Informal consultation / public exhibition feedback,
- 2 - Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane – Revised proposals for which authority to formally advertise is being sought,
- 3 - Dorking Road (Chilworth), Lower Road (Effingham) and School Lane (Pirbright) – Proposals for which authority to formally advertise is being sought,
- 4 - Formal advertisement of various proposals – Overall summary of resultant representations,
- 5 - Formal advertisement of various proposals – Consideration of detailed representations with Officer comments and recommendations,
- 6 - Proposals for which authority to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) is being sought,
- 7 - Additional locations – list of proposals for which authority to formally advertise is being sought,
- 8 - Correction to minute 85/15.

Sources/background papers:

- Item 9, Guildford Local Committee, 11 December 2013
 - Item 13, Guildford Local Committee, 24 September 2014
 - Items 15 & 16, Guildford Local Committee, 17 June 2015
-