



GUILDFORD CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE, REVIEW OF TOWN CENTRE ZONES

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

1st DECEMBER 2005

KEY ISSUE

This report recommends creating new parking spaces and making adjustments to dual use parking places and to other restrictions. The report also sets out comments and objections received to changes necessary to parking restrictions for the Friary Development.

SUMMARY

The report presents:

- (i) proposals to create more parking spaces in all areas of the CPZ but particularly areas A to E.
- (ii) proposals to convert a number of dual use parking spaces in areas A, B, E & F to permit only so as to create more space for permit holders.
- (iii) results of the residents' survey conducted in areas A to E and recommendations to changing the permit scheme.
- (iv) representations received as a result of advertising changes to restrictions necessary to facilitate the Friary Development.

Report by

Surrey Atlas Ref.

GBC PARKING SERVICES MANAGER

N/A

GUILDFORD B.C. WARD(S)

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

ALL, but in particular
FRIARY & ST NICOLAS
HOLY TRINITY

ALL, but in particular
GUILDFORD WEST, SOUTH & EAST

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) the changes outlined on the plans in **ANNEXE 1**,
- (ii) the criteria for obtaining a permit in all the catchment areas is changed so that residents who own their own vehicle are required to produce a Vehicle Registration Document showing their name and the address from which they are applying for a permit,
- (iii) that the cost of a first permit be increased to £35 and the cost of a second to £65 for all areas in the Controlled Parking Zone,
- (iv) that the proposed changes in (i) (ii) & (iii) are advertised with the intention of making an Orders under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984,
- (v) that it is the intention of Surrey County Council to make an Order under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, giving effect to the changes highlighted on the plan attached as **ANNEXE 5**, with the exception of the change to the pay and display bays on Chertsey Street.
- (vi) that the change proposed in paragraph 35 to the restrictions in Chertsey Street be advertised with the intention to make an Order under the relevant provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND

1. In the central catchment areas of the Controlled Parking Zone A,B, C,D,& E the main concerns are the availability of space and the increase in the number of permits. The table below repeats a table included in the December 2004 report but with the permit figures updated following the renewal of all permits in September 2005. The latest data still shows an increase over the 2003 levels but the 2005 levels are likely to rise as students and others apply.

ZONE	No. of Permits Issued			% Change since 2003	SPACES AVAILABLE		% Permit Only
	2005	2004	2003		Permit Only Spaces	Total Spaces	
	A	972	1008		890	+9	
B	421	442	407	+3	198	371	53
C	291	343	307	-5	132	272	49
D	252	245	252	0	121	563	41
E	250	299	246	+2	109	297	37
F	340	370	368	+8	43	600	7
G	40	39	39	+3	0	113	0
H	108	115	99	+8	0	313	0
I	103	91	75	+37	20	313	6
J	120	125	106	+13	0	348	0

2. The criterion for issuing a permit is similar in all the catchment areas except area D, the town centre. In area D there is a limit on the number of permits set at 255 and there is a waiting list for permits for new residents. A household can only get a permit for area D if the property has no off street parking. Applicants who qualify but are waiting for an area D permit can apply for a permit for an adjacent area. Residents in area D who have one off street parking space and two cars can apply for a permit for an adjacent area.
3. There are currently 91 residents on the waiting list for Area D. The following number of adjacent area permits have been issued; Area A, 33, Area B, 3, Area C, 12 and Area H 30. To stop bays near the boundary being monopolised by area D residents with adjacent area permits a cap has been put on the number of adjacent area permits for each area. The limits are Area A 60, Area B 10, Area C 30 and area H 60.
4. In areas A,B,C & E the criteria allows a household to park up to two cars using permits but the entitlement is reduced by one for every off street parking space. For example a household with 2 cars and one off street space can obtain one permit. In area E households in Stockton Road and a part of Stoke Road can obtain one permit even if they have an off street space.
5. The Controlled Parking Zone operates between 8.30 am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday.
6. In area D the space is restricted by using three different types of bay. There are permit only bays which can only be used by resident permit holders. Pay and Display parking bays which can only be used by people purchasing a ticket. The length of stay in a Pay and Display bay is limited to between half an hour and three hours. Dual use bays can be used either by purchasing a pay and display ticket or by a permit holder.
7. In areas A,B,C & E there are no Pay and Display Bays. In these areas the bays are either for permit holders only or for permit holder for any length of time and non-permit holders for a restricted amount of time usually 2 hours.

INCREASING SPACE FOR PERMIT HOLDERS

8. Plans for creating more space in areas A,B,C,D & E and changing some dual use into permit only spaces in areas A,B,C,D & E and small parts of F were presented to the Committee at its meeting on 26th May 2005. At the same meeting the Committee agreed that a survey of residents should be conducted in areas A to E.
9. The distribution of the survey was used to publicise the plans to amend the parking bays in areas A to E. The survey was dispatched in July with a closing date for completed replies of 26th August and drew residents attention to the plans which were available for viewing in the parking office and on Guildford Borough and Surrey County Councils websites.

10. The plans to create more space were widely welcomed. There was concern that reducing the amount of dual use parking in area C would limit the ability of visitors to park during the day. It was considered unnecessary because of the availability of space during the weekday was not a significant problem. It is recommend that the space is increased in areas A,B,C,D & E and increase in change goes ahead in areas A,B & E and part of F.
11. There are also some minor changes proposed in H and J. To give Members the full picture the plans show all the proposed changes in these areas and are annotated to show the ones which have already been agreed and advertised. The nine plans together with a key plan are attached to this report as **ANNEXE 1**. The following abbreviations are used on these plans:
- | | |
|------|-----------------------------|
| LW | Limited Waiting |
| DBHO | Disabled Badge Holders Only |
| M-S | Monday to Saturday |
| P&D | Pay and Display |
| DYL | Double yellow line |
| SYL | Single Yellow Line |
| DU | Dual Use |
12. The effect is to create over 150 new bays in areas A to E and to convert almost 200 dual use bays to permit only in areas A, B & E.

SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS SURVEY

13. A copy of the survey document is attached as **ANNEXE 2**. Over 6,000 copies were circulated and 1,092 copies were returned. This represents a response rate of just under 20%.
14. The survey has produced a wealth of information on car ownership, people views on the availability of space as well as preferences for action to be taken. A copy of the consultants’ summary is attached as **ANNEXE 3** and a further analysis is attached as **ANNEXE 4**. It should be noted that the percentages presented in the consultants report are calculated against the total responses whereas the further analysis only uses those who have expressed a view. The percentages below refer to the analysis in **ANNEXE 4**.
15. There are a number of key findings:
- Almost 70% of residents reported that they could normally park in their own street and 60% of these could park within 50m of their home
 - The easiest time to park was between 8.00am and 6.00pm on weekdays
 - The most difficult times were in the evenings and at weekends, which is when most residents are at home.
 - Only area A was marginally in favour of changing the hours of control, the other areas opposed any change

- Over 80% of residents favoured strengthening the application criteria to make it harder for non residents to obtain a permit
- Just under 50% supported reducing permit eligibility to 1 permit per households for new residents, there was also strong opposition to the proposal
- Just fewer than half of the residents supported increasing the price of a second permit to deter use, with the exception of Area A where only a third expressed support.
- There was also support in areas A,B & E for reducing the waiting period for non-residents from 2 to 1 hour.

Hours of Control

16. The existing hours of control operate Monday to Saturday 8.30 to 6.00. Outside these hours parking is not restricted in residents, dual use or pay and display parking bays or on single yellow lines provided an obstruction is not caused.
17. Area D the most central zone has the highest density of businesses attracting non-residents and 60% of respondents were opposed to any change in the hours of control. Area A was the only area to marginally supported a change in the controlled hours. The data from the survey suggests that the number of residents vehicles that makes parking difficult in areas other than D and extending the hours would reduce parking opportunities by extending controls on single yellow lines.
18. Some residents in Area A consider Non-residents park after 5.00pm to avoid car park charges and spend the evening in Guildford. The frequency of patrols from parking attendants will be adjusted to give more attention to these times.

Strengthening the application criteria

19. Over 80 % of residents who responded were in favour of strengthening the criteria to stop non-residents obtaining a permit. Currently applicants are asked for proof of ownership of the vehicle which can take the form of the Vehicle Registration Document, proof of purchase or an insurance certificate. Different evidence is required for company vehicles. Applicants are also required to produce an official document with their address.
20. Every vehicle owner should have their vehicle registered to their address. Asking for sight of the vehicle registration document rather than any other document is the best way to link the applicant to the vehicle and to their home address.
21. In order to achieve this the criteria should be amended to require the vehicle registration document to be produced showing the applicants name and their address in the CPZ. New residents will require time to change the documents and a temporary permit will be issued.

22. In addition the declaration on the application form will be strengthened and it will be made clearer that legal action can be taken against anyone making a false statement to obtain a permit.

Off Street Parking

23. The survey results indicate that a small number of people have a permit and are not entitled because they have off street parking. Greater checks on the availability of off street parking will help ensure that permits are issued on a consistent and fair basis.
24. There are also cases where residents have off street parking space but choose not to use the facility or feel they cannot because their vehicle is too large to fit in. Officers will assess these cases on the basis that residents must use their off street space even if this means minor adaptations or, in time, opting for a vehicle that fits within the space or garage.

Reducing Permit Eligibility for New Residents

25. Depending on area between 47 and 50% of respondents were in favour of reducing the permit eligibility to one permit per household for new residents. There was also a strong reaction against the proposal. It is recommended that the effect of the other proposals in this report be put in place and the results monitored before considering this option.

The Cost of a Permit

26. Annual residents permit currently cost £30 for the first and £50 for a second. The price has not changed since 1997 when a permit cost £70 for two years (£35 per year). The price of a permit is intended to cover the cost of administering the scheme so that those who use the service pay for it. The cost of administering the scheme in 2006/07 is likely to be around £163,000 and the income from permit sales is £112,000. This leaves a £51,000 deficit. As members are aware, the County Council's policy is that residents parking schemes should be largely self-financing and therefore we should not be perpetuating an annual loss. This seems to be around 26% deficit in the 2004/05 financial year.
27. If the permit had increased by inflation each year, assuming a rate of 4% then the £30 permit would have increased to £43 and the £50 permit to £71.
28. There are approximately 2,000 first permits and 1,000 second permits. Those who responded to the residents survey showed some support for increasing the cost of the second to deter ownership of a second vehicle.
29. An increase of £10 in the first permit and £31 in the second would cover the deficit. However it is recommended that the cost be increased by £5 for the first permit and £15 for the second. This is estimated to achieve an extra £25,000. The situation can then be reconsidered at the next CPZ review. In addition there is a to ensure that a regular review of fees is carried out. It is recommended that the fees be reviewed on annual basis

and that any increases be implemented every other year. We do also need to make sure that any further increases should cover the shortfall already incurring. For example: inflation increases plus additional percentage until we reach the appropriate fee.

30. The first permit will cost £35, the same level as it was at in 1997, and the second permit would cost £65

Reducing the Limited Waiting Period

31. In Areas A two thirds of those who responded wanted to reduce the waiting period for non-permit holders in dual use bays to 1 hour. The proposal was also considered favourably in areas B & E. These are the area where it is recommended to convert dual use parking bays into residents only. While increasing the amount of space for residents this will make it harder for visitors to find space. In view of this it is considered preferable to judge the effect of this change before looking at further reducing the ability of visitors to park.

Visitor Daily Permits and Traders

32. There is an initial limit of 30 daily permits a year for residents. Officers currently monitor the number issued per household. When requests are received for more they will be considered.
33. There are also instances when a property has been bought for refurbishment and there is no resident but access is required. Currently officers are issuing one permit per working day if they are satisfied that there is work being conducted at the property. A number of developers seek more than this level but these requests are not accepted due to pressure on space.
34. The survey shows that the current use of daily visitors cards does not causes a significant problem. It is therefore recommended that these practices continue.

FRIARY DEVELOPMENT CHANGES TO RESTRICTIONS

35. In July the Committee agreed to advertise proposals to change a number of parking restrictions and other traffic orders to facilitate the development of the Friary (Item 14, 21st July). The proposals include revoking the waiting restrictions on Commercial Road and the part of Woodbridge Road which it is proposed to stop up. Two of the proposed changes have received objections. The plan of all the proposed changes is included in **ANNEXE 5** and details of the objections received are attached as **ANNEXE 6**.
36. The Pay and Display Bays in Chertsey Street need to be removed to allow greater traffic flow along Chertsey Street when vehicles are not permitted to turn into North Street. It was proposed to replace the parking place with a no waiting and no loading at any time restriction which would apply 24 hours a day and at the loss of facilities for customers.

37. A number of the businesses would withdraw their objections if the restriction was changed to a no waiting at any time restriction with loading or unloading only restricted to peak hours, 8.30am to 9.30 am and 5pm to 6.00pm. If it were considered that the original proposal was still necessary then a public enquiry would be required to resolve the objections. It is recommended that the Committee agree to reduce the loading restriction to peak hours 8.30am to 9.30am and 5pm to 6pm.
38. There is also an objection from a disabled badge holder to the removal of 2 disabled parking bays at the junction of Friary Street and North Street. This is needed to change the highway layout. It is not possible to replace the bays in the locality but alternative space was proposed in Quarry Street and Ward Street. In addition the Borough Council has increased the availability of disabled bays in Bedford Road Multi Storey Car Park which links through the Friary to this area. It is recommended that this objection be not supported.
39. The Committee is asked to agree to alter the proposal in Chertsey Street and agree to the alternative being advertised and to overrule the objection to the removal of the 2-disabled parking space on the basis that alternative provision has been made.

COMMENTS FROM LOCAL MEMBERS

40. A meeting was organised for Members responsible for permit areas A to E and the results of the survey discussed with them.
41. Councillor Goodwin has asked for consideration to be given to converting the dual use parking bays in Testard Road and Wherwell Road to permit only to create more space for residents in these roads. He has also requested that the Committee give consideration to changing the permit only bay which runs down the side of No 10 Dunsdon Avenue and the back of Farnham Road Hospital to provide more dual use space.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

42. The estimate for changing the bays is £32,000. The increase in the cost of a permit is estimated to increase income by £25,000.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

43. The growth of car ownership from residents in the town centre places increased demand for parking and the report details a range of options for controlling this for now and the future.

LEAD OFFICER KEVIN MCKEE, PARKING MANAGER GBC

TELEPHONE NUMBER 01483 444530

BACKGROUND PAPERS:
