



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(Epsom and Ewell)**

**EPSOM AND EWELL PARKING / WAITING
RESTRICTION (PHASE 6) REVIEW**

Annex 2

If the permit zones are agreed then we will need to carry out letter drops and gather feedback, before formal advertising. We don't want to pursue anything that is not required by an overwhelming majority – this will consequently mean that formal advertising is not likely to happen until autumn 2011.

Clarification of Controlled / Residents Permit Zones:

A controlled parking zone (CPZ) enables us to have a standard parking restriction throughout an area (indicated by zone entry signs) without the need of additional signing for every stretch of single yellow line. This reduces street clutter, which is important to residents, and is a policy that Surrey County Council supports. Signs are still required for all parking bays.

There is no such thing as defined by the DfT as a Residents Permit (or Parking) Zone. We can introduce resident permit bays either individually, or within a CPZ, the only difference being the matter of signage for single yellow lines. Properties entitled to permits are listed in the traffic regulation order (TRO).

An area that is set aside for resident permit holders only is easier than a CPZ to extend in the future. There is not necessarily a need for yellow lines across dropped kerbs, as they can be enforced separately. We would however recommend the installation of yellow lines in areas where it is required for safety reasons.

Another option to consider is that we can extend parking bays across dropped kerbs, and mark out the access with white 'H-Bars'. This reduces the amount of yellow lines required, and by reducing the number of individual parking bays reduces the number of signs required for parking bays. It also increases parking capacity of the road by allowing the resident or visitor to park across their driveway (although a permit would still be required in operational times). We would, however, only wish to introduce this type of scheme where the road/zone is under heavy parking pressure, as the markings can be misunderstood, or abused.

Zones without road markings:

www.surreycc.gov.uk/epsomandewell

Please note that during previous discussions with DfT over a scheme in Spelthorne, it was stressed by them that the roads in question had to have some significant features, for example, block paving, cobbles or an historical feature as opposed to a normal black topped road. This is to prevent the spread of this type of scheme in all roads.

This particular scheme, in Lammas Close is being evaluated before introducing further schemes of this type across the County.

Extracts from The Traffic Signs Manual – Chapter 3:

Where the road is a cul-de-sac and all parking is for permit holders only, the signing described in para 7.15 might be appropriate (see below), but this will require authorisation from the Department (see para 2.1, below). In this case there would be no road markings within the road concerned, but it would be designated as a parking place for permit holders.

7.15 Where parking in an entire road is reserved solely for permit holders and where no other parking or loading activities are permitted, it might be possible to provide signs at the entrance to the road and dispense with signs and bay markings within the road itself. It should be noted that such signs are not prescribed by the Regulations and will require authorisation (see para 2.1). Many roads will not be suitable for this type of signing and any proposed scheme should be discussed with the Department at an early stage. The most likely candidates would be a cul-de-sac or a small network of roads with little or no through traffic. This type of signing might be appropriate in an environmentally sensitive area, or near a large sports stadium where parking restrictions are required only on certain days of the year. In this case a special direction should be sought from the Department (see para 2.1) to allow the signs to be used without bay markings.

Any part of a road may include a prohibition of waiting (which would apply equally to permit holders) and be signed and marked.

Signs indicating the end of the permit holder parking area will be needed, unless it is a cul-de-sac, and again these will require authorisation.

2.1 All traffic signs placed on a highway or on a road to which the public has access (right of passage in Scotland), as defined in section 142 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and amended by the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, must be either prescribed by Regulations or authorised by the Secretary of State for Transport (for installations in England), the Department for Regional Development (Northern Ireland), the Scottish Executive or the Welsh Assembly Government as appropriate. Care should be taken to ensure that signs are used only as prescribed in the Regulations, and in accordance with any relevant directions, and that no non-prescribed sign is used unless it has been formally authorized in writing. Failure to do so may leave an authority open to litigation, or make a traffic regulation order unenforceable. There could be circumstances where it might be appropriate to use prescribed signs in a manner that is not strictly in accordance with the Directions. In such cases, a special direction (not an authorisation), given in writing, should be sought from the Department. Except in the case of certain signs to indicate temporary obstructions or placed by the police in an emergency, signs may be placed only by or with the permission of the traffic authority.

General:

Not all of the zones that were requested are eligible for the type of zone where there are no markings. The majority of areas that have been flagged up already have a significant amount of yellow lines – these would need to be removed, thus causing damage to the highway and looking even more unsightly than the existing yellow lines (Please note the comments above).

The only area that could possibly be eligible for the type of zone with no markings is Ladbroke Road. This area has no existing markings and residents park part on the footway. By introducing a zone with markings, we would have to abide by the Traffic Signs Regulations as well as Surrey Policy and would not be able to allow footway parking, thus halving the potential parking. Not having markings would still allow the footway parking although it is not something that we would promote.

From an engineering point of view we would recommend that parking should not be encouraged on the footway in this particular road as it reduces the width of the footway to less than 1.2m on both sides, and in fact reduces it significantly enough not to allow for the safe passage of wheelchair users of parents with prams / pushchairs – they would have to walk in the road.

We would also recommend that if footway parking were to be allowed that the footways on both sides be strengthened to a satisfactory standard, as it is apparent that damage is being caused by footway parking at present and could lead to damage to underlying services.

Site details:

When carrying out the review we made notes of exactly how much off street parking was available to each individual house within the proposed zones. Our plans also reflect where we consider the existing parking will be offset to – the zones therefore in some cases, may seem to cover a larger area than expected. These can of course be reduced as appropriate.

Please refer to the table on following pages for further details.

Road(s)	Drawing no(s)	Anticipated approximate on street capacity	Recommended permit scheme type	Comments
Kingston Road	22	10 (+2 in front of private accesses)	Permit bay (non-CPZ)	13 of the 15 properties have no designated parking - this will remove competition from non-residents for spaces. One long bay is proposed, with an Access Protection Marking provided to highlighted the access for 24 and 26. The residents or their visitors can then park in front of their own access with a permit if desired, maximising the on street capacity.
Adelphi Road	32	16	Permit bays (non-CPZ)	In addition to the proposed residents permit bays, residents do have an off street car park.
Whyeths Road	37	49	Permit bays (non-CPZ)	Whyeths Mews is private and has therefore not been included in the proposals.
Ladbroke Road	41	NA	Permit zone	As residents are parking on the footway, to implement standard controls would reduce capacity by approximately 50%. We are therefore proposing a permit zone which would simply be indicated by signs and the entry points indicating 'permit holders only beyond this point'. No road markings would be applied. However, special authorisation is required from the DfT for this type of scheme.
Rosebank	43	63 (including grasscrete areas)	Permit bays (non-CPZ)	There are also 19 garages in the vicinity, although these may not be available to residents.
Wheelers Lane	44	49	Permit bays (non-CPZ)	The figures do not currently include Lane End, although would recommend including in permit allocation at they do not have any on street capacity as the road is too narrow.
Chalk Lane	48	13	Permit bays (non-CPZ)	The figures currently exclude Woodcote Mews, but they may need to be included in permit allocation.
West Gardens	52 / 53	160	CPZ, with permit bays	
Middle Lane / Lintons Lane	54	132	CPZ, with permit bays	Some properties have access to garages at the back of the properties, but we cannot be sure how many are used for storage or parking vehicles
Hawthorne Place / Delaport Close	55	29	Permit bays (non-CPZ)	Most residents have off street parking.

Beaconsfield Place / Providence Place	55	70	CPZ, with permit bays	The footways are very narrow here, and we would therefore recommend a CPZ in order to reduce signage and street clutter. Residents have very little off street parking.
Clayton Road	55	4	Permit bays (non-CPZ)	There are 4 houses in Clayton Road, one of which has off street parking.
Town Centre	56	69	CPZ, with permit bays	There are several maisonnettes in this are and it is difficult to determine the number of spaces per property.
Hazon Way / Maidenshaw Road / Gosfield Road / Horsley Close	64	78	CPZ, with permit bays	Every property in the proposed zone has off street parking, and over 80% of houses have two or more. It is therefore likely that demand will be far lower than supply, and there is potential that the costs of implementing and managing the zone would be greater than those recovered in resident and visitor permit revenues. Furthermore, other difficulties may arise with non residents vehicles being offset into other areas.