

OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)

PROPOSED RESIDENT PARKING SCHEMES IN WALTON

1 MARCH 2010

KEY ISSUE

To assess the result of the consultation on proposed resident permit schemes undertaken in Sandy Way and in Thames Street, Dale, Harvey and Mayo Roads.

SUMMARY

Residents of Sandy Way and Thames Street, Dale, Harvey and Mayo Roads rejected the proposed resident permit parking scheme put forward in July 2009, but the responses to the proposals suggested that they would still like some form of resident parking scheme. A revised scheme was therefore devised and residents of these roads were asked for their view of the new proposals.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Elmbridge) is asked to agree:

- (i) That neither permit scheme is introduced at this time;
- (ii) That the proposed double yellow lines in Sandy Way are implemented;
- (iii) That the County Council makes amendments to existing traffic regulation orders (TROs) to allow for the recommended restrictions to be implemented;

- (iv) That these amendments are duly advertised and that any objections to the proposals are considered in line with the council's constitution; and
- (v) That the TRO amendments are made and the restrictions introduced.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 A proposed controlled parking scheme in Walton was first developed following consultation with residents, businesses and other stakeholders in August and September 2007. The details were refined following on street surveys and site assessments, which took place in November and December 2008.
- 1.2 Following public exhibitions in July 2009, the proposals were further refined in light of the resultant feedback and were presented to the Local Committee at its meeting on 21 September 2009.
- 1.3 The proposals were then written into a traffic regulation order, which was duly advertised, and the objections to the proposed order were reported to the Local Committee on 7 December 2009. Following this meeting the traffic regulation order was made on 1 February 2010, and implementation is now being arranged.
- 1.4 The only proposals, which were neither abandoned or progressed as a result of the above process, were for two resident permit schemes, one in Sandy Way and the other in Thames Street, Dale Road, Mayo Road and Harvey Road. In these roads the feedback from the exhibitions suggested that although residents did not agree with the proposals put forward in July 2009, there was a desire for some form of permit scheme to be introduced.
- 1.5 A further consultation was therefore carried out with the residents of these roads, who were sent a letter, a plan of a revised permit scheme and a short questionnaire in January 2010, with a request that they let us know their view of the revised proposals. Copies of the documents can be found in Annex A.

2 ANALYSIS

2.1 The table below shows a summary of the responses received:

Road	No. of letters delivered	No. of responses	For	Against	Other
Thames Street	54	24	16	7	1
Dale Road	31	22	10	12	0
Harvey Road	19	12	8	4	0
Mayo Road	42	18	6	11	1
Dale/Harvey/Mayo (response received with no road name specified)		9	1	8	0
Sandy Way	63	27	7	10	10
New Zealand Avenue	14	2	2	0	0

- 2.2 Overall the proposal for the Thames Street, Dale/Harvey/Mayo Roads area received an inconclusive response with an almost 50/50 split for and against. However even in some of the responses supporting the proposal, reservations were expressed about the resident and visitor permit allocation.
- 2.3 Taking Thames Street alone, there appears to be a majority in favour of the proposals, however a significant number of the responses did not agree with the proposed allocation of residents and visitors permits. Although a residents' permit parking scheme could be introduced in this road in isolation, it is likely that it would only be welcomed if the permit allocation was changed.
- 2.4 The majority of responses from Dale Road, Harvey Road and Mayo Road were against the proposals. Of the three a clear majority of residents in Harvey Road supported the proposals. However owing to the layout of the roads, it would be difficult to introduce a permit scheme in this road on its own, without marking out bays on the road, which is not likely to be welcomed, as was shown in the responses to such a plan, which were received following the public exhibitions in July 2009.
- 2.5 The majority of residents in the Sandy Way/New Zealand Avenue area were against the scheme in its existing format. The Sandy Way Residents Association provided an auxiliary response form, that they distributed to all the residents in the area, which contained a number of suggested changes to the scheme. These were (a) that every household should be granted at least one resident's permit, regardless of the

amount of off street parking, (b) that the scheme should operate between 8am and 8pm every day of the week (c) that double yellow lines are introduced on the internal corners outside numbers 23 and 50 Sandy Way. This form made it clear that the proposals would only be acceptable if all the suggested changes were introduced.

- 2.6 Although the suggested double yellow lines could be installed, regardless of whether a scheme is introduced or not, it appears that extending the hours of operation would only receive popular support if the permit allocation were changed as well.
- 2.7 It is clear from very many responses that many residents have an issue with the proposed allocation of residents' and visitors' permits, and that this both qualifies supportive responses as well as causing people to reject the proposed schemes. The allocation of permits is consistent with that offered in other resident parking schemes across Elmbridge and elsewhere in Surrey. However it is a policy that is under review, not least because it was developed at a time when fewer cars were owned per household.
- 2.8 In the circumstances, it is recommended that neither scheme is progressed at this time. However if the policy on permit allocation is changed significantly in future, the proposals should be revisited and consulted on again in due course.
- 2.9 It is however recommended that the double yellow lines are introduced on the internal corners of Sandy Way, outside numbers 23 and 50, for a distance of 10 meters from the corner in each direction. It is further recommended that the proposed double yellow lines that will run alongside number 50 are extended into the whole of the turning circle outside numbers 46 and 48.

3 OPTIONS

- 3.1 Agree with the recommendations.
- 3.2 Reject the recommendations and introduce the schemes.
- 3.3 Amend the recommendations.

4 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 If the recommendations are agreed, the installation of the proposed double yellow lines would be implemented alongside any other amendments that are made in Elmbridge following the parking review, which is being reported separately to this committee, and the cost absorbed in those works. If the recommendations are rejected and the schemes introduced, funding would need to be allocated.

5 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no equalities and diversity implications.

6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That neither parking scheme be introduced at the present time.
- 7.2 That some at any time waiting restrictions are introduced in Sandy Way.

8 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 The proposed schemes would not receive sufficient support in their current format.
- 8.2 The proposed waiting restrictions would aid access, particularly for larger vehicles.

LEAD OFFICER: Rikki Hill, Parking Projects Manager

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 03456 009 009

E-MAIL: parking@surreycc.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER: Rikki Hill, Parking Projects Manager

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 03456 009 009

E-MAIL: parking@surreycc.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Local Committee Report 'WALTON PROPOSED

CONTROLLED PARKING SCHEME:

CONSIDERATION OF FORMAL OBJECTIONS' 7 December

2009

Local Committee Report 'WALTON CONTROLLED

PARKING SCHEME - CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS'

21 September 2009