



OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)

TILT ROAD CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

27 JULY 2009

KEY ISSUE

To acknowledge the result of the formal consultation, following the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order, and to decide how to proceed with the parking controls scheme in Tilt Road

SUMMARY

Following the advertisement of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order, there is a period of 21 days during which people can make objections to any aspect of the order. During this period Surrey County Council received 6 objections. Officers have identified possible solutions to resolve the objections and a decision is needed on which option to pursue.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

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

- (i) The proposals for a controlled parking zone in Tilt Road are revised to include more on street residents parking provision, and then re-advertised, subject to the availability of funding.
- (ii) If that funding is not available a reduced scheme is implemented with no restrictions in Tilt Road between Bray Road and Stoke Road.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 A report was presented to the Local Committee on 16 June 2008, outlining proposals for a controlled parking zone in Tilt Road. The committee agreed that the proposals should be formally advertised, which happened in May and June 2009.
- 1.2 Where Local Committee approves a scheme which when advertised attracts objections from the public which are not withdrawn following discussions between objectors and officers and Members, the objections will be reported to Local Committee so that Members may consider the substance of the objections and decide whether the scheme should go ahead despite those objections or whether the objections are of such weight as to justify the withdrawal of the scheme as currently drafted.
- 1.3 There were 6 objections received.

2 ANALYSIS

- 2.1 All of the objections raise the issue of the lack of on street residents' parking provision on Tilt Road between its junction with Bray Road and its junction with Stoke Road, in particular in the vicinities of New Cottages, Old Cottages and Peacock Cottages, where some of the properties have no off street parking.
- 2.2 Two of the objections also suggest that additional double yellow lines are needed at the junction of Bray Road and Tilt Close in order to improve lines of sight for safety reasons.
- 2.3 Two of the objections also refer to the issue of vehicles parking on verges, however if parking restrictions are introduced it would be possible to take enforcement action against parking on the verges during the operational hours.
- 2.4 Issues about the process and the extent of the consultation were also raised as well as concerns about possible detrimental effect on the street scene if yellow lines and parking bays are installed.
- 2.5 As all the objections raised the same issue of a lack of on street parking bays, it is this that is evidently of most concern and which will therefore drive the options available.

3 OPTIONS

- 3.1 There appear to be three options:
 - i. Withdraw the scheme in its entirety

- ii. Revert to an earlier scheme design and remove the parking controls between Bray Road and Stoke Road
 - iii. Keep controls between Bray Road and Stoke Road, but revise them to include residents' parking bays near properties with no off street parking.
- 3.2 Many of the objectors (and previously the majority of consultees) expressed a desire to have some parking controls introduced, so it would not be desirable to proceed with the first option.
- 3.3 The second option would solve the problem of a lack of on street parking bays. However it is likely that vehicles that currently park beyond Bray (where the new restrictions would still go in) will instead park in the part of Tilt Road between Bray Road and Stoke Road and so deprive the residents with no off street parking of space on street
- 3.4 The third option would allow most of the objections to be resolved. It would also allow the possibility of introducing double yellow lines at the junction with Tilt Close. However because it involves adding additional features to those already proposed, it would mean that the proposals would need to be advertised and consulted on again. This would of course delay the implementation of the controls.

4 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 As can be seen from the report from June 2008, this is a scheme that has been funded by Elmbridge Borough Council. The first two options would require no additional funding to that already allocated. The third option would necessitate the Borough Council finding the additional funding required to cover the cost of advertising the new proposals and carrying out the formal consultation.

5 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 None.

6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 None.

7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 There are three options to resolve the objections against proposed restrictions:
- i. Withdraw the scheme in its entirety

- ii. Revert to an earlier scheme design and remove the parking controls between Bray Road and Stoke Road
- iii. Keep controls between Bray Road and Stoke Road, but revise them to include residents' parking bays near properties with no off street parking

7.2 This report recommends that the third option be pursued, subject to funding being available from Elmbridge Borough Council.

7.3 If funding is not available, this report recommends pursuing the second option, and monitoring the effect it has on Tilt Road between Bray Road and Stoke Road, particularly with regard to migration of the parking.

8 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Residents of the area clearly wish to have some parking controls in the area, so complete withdrawal of the scheme does not seem appropriate.

8.2 The third option meets the desire of residents (including the majority of objectors) to have parking controls, and also resolves the main reason for the objections.

8.3 The second option is a fall back position which would allow some controls to be introduced without the need for additional funding.

9 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

9.1 If the Committee agrees with the recommendation and funding is available, officers will revise the scheme to include more on street parking and re-advertise the new proposals.

9.2 If no objections are received to the new proposals, the Traffic Regulation Order will be made and the revised scheme will be implemented.

9.3 If funding is not available and the Committee agrees to the second option, officers would proceed with the implementation of the reduced scheme.

LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER: Rikki Hill, Parking Projects Manager

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 03456 009 009

E-MAIL: parking@surreycc.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Local Committee report – 'X6868 TILT ROAD' 16 June 2008