



GUILDFORD CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

1st DECEMBER 2005

KEY ISSUE

The Committee is asked to consider the formal representations received as a result of the statutory advertisement and agree to implement the scheme with amendments.

SUMMARY

There has been considerable consultation regarding the proposed extension to the Controlled Parking Zone. This report summarises the process and contains detailed summaries of the representations received. The Committee is recommended to overrule the objections and agree to the implementation of the scheme.

Report by

GBC PARKING SERVICES MANAGER

Surrey Atlas Ref.

Pages 109 F1, 110 A1 - A2

GUILDFORD B.C. WARD(S)

CHRISTCHURCH

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

GUILDFORD SOUTHEAST

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) that the proposed extension to the Controlled Parking Zone into the area detailed on the plan in **ANNEXE 1** of this report be implemented with the minor amendments detailed in **ANNEXE 2** and shown on the plan attached as **ANNEXE 1** but with the exclusion of the unadopted part of Cranley Close.
- (ii) the intention of Surrey County Council to make Orders under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, including sections 1,2,4,32,35 and 36 and Parts III and IV of schedule 9, giving effect to the proposed extension of the Controlled Parking Zone be advertised and that, if no objections are maintained, the Orders be made
- (iii) that following consideration and, where possible, resolution of any objections received, the Orders be made.
- (iv) that it does not support objections which have not been resolved.
- (v) that during the next review of the Controlled Parking Zone the effectiveness of the scheme be assessed to identify any amendments which may be necessary.

INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND

1. In December 2004 the Committee considered a recommendation to conduct a consultation to seek views from residents on extending the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) eastwards up to Boxgrove Road. This followed a meeting between officers and representatives of residents associations for Aldersey Road, Tormead Road, Cranley Road, Hillier Road and Pit Farm Road. The representatives had consulted with their members and maintained they would be in favour of extending the Controlled Parking Zone to deal with the parking problems experienced in the area. The Committee agreed to this proposal.
2. A letter was distributed in March 2005 to all residents in the area asking them whether they considered there was a parking problem, and whether they wanted to see the CPZ extended into their area. Enclosed with this letter was a leaflet explaining the basis of the existing Controlled Parking Zone, including details of the times restrictions applied.
3. The responses showed strong support from most of the residents in the area. In May the Committee agreed to conduct detailed consultation on the basis of extending the CPZ within a defined area which consisted of roads that supported inclusion.
4. There was concern about the potential displacement of the cars currently parking in the area into Tangier and St. Omer Road which were not included in the proposed extension. As a result detailed plans to include these two roads in the scheme were included in the consultation so the residents and other users could consider the position further.

5. A further leaflet was distributed to all addresses in the consultation area and copies were placed on cars parked in the area. The leaflet gave details of the areas to be included, other information like the times the proposed scheme would operate and it invited residents to view the plans either on the internet or at one of 4 exhibitions.
6. All the written comments were assessed and reported to the Local Committee in July 2005. As a result of these comments a number of amendments were made to the original proposals. St Omer Road and Tangier Road were excluded from the scheme. Further consultation took place with Tormead Road before formally advertising the proposals. Residents of the road were invited to a meeting and it was clear that views were widely split on whether controls were needed, what type of controls would be appropriate and when they should operate. A detailed questionnaire was circulated to all residents to assess their views. The results were that 9 did not want to be in the CPZ, 15 supported proposals put forward as circulated or with minor amendments, 22 supported a solution within the CPZ with no parking bays but single yellow lines down the road and double yellow lines at the junctions. As a result a revised proposal for Tormead Road was put forward with a reduced amount of parking.
7. An advertisement for the proposed extension appeared in the Surrey Advertiser on 30th September 2005 with a closing date of 21st October 2005 for representations. **ANNEXE 2** of this report details the written representations received together with the officers' recommendation.

ISSUES ARISING

8. A detailed summary of all correspondence received is included in **ANNEXE 2** of this report. The file of correspondence is available for inspection at the parking office or by contacting the parking manager. The Committee is asked to consider the issues raised. There was substantial consultation prior to the scheme being advertised and many concerns were addressed at this stage. A number of the issues detailed in the representations were also raised at the consultation prior to advertising and considered by the Committee at that stage. The details are contained in the report presented to the Committee on 21st July 2005.
9. The table overleaf shows the responses to the initial consultation for the roads which have been included in the proposed extension. The letter sent to each resident included a leaflet detailing the proposed times the scheme would operate and other details of the existing CPZ. This survey was done before the detailed proposals were drawn up but it shows the level of support for the extension of the CPZ.

EASTWARD EXTENSION OF CPZ QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - SUMMARY

Road	No. of homes	Replies		Is there a parking problem in your road?						Extend the CPZ to include your road?					
		No.	%	Yes		No		No View		Yes		No		No View	
				No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Aldersey Road	26	18	69%	18	100%	0	0%	0	0%	18	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Avonmore Ave	17	13	76%	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Broadwater Rise	26	22	85%	12	55%	9	41%	1	5%	14	64%	8	36%	0	0%
Cranley Close	19	11	58%	4	36%	7	64%	0	0%	7	64%	4	36%	0	0%
Cranley Road	77	26	34%	16	62%	10	38%	0	0%	17	65%	7	27%	1	4%
Epsom Road	29	6	21%	1	17%	5	83%	0	0%	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%
Fielders Green	6	5	83%	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hillier Road	35	15	43%	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%
London Road	31	5	16%	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%
Pit Farm Road	56	31	55%	23	74%	7	23%	0	0%	23	74%	7	23%	0	0%
St Mildreds Road	18	10	56%	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%	3	30%	6	60%	1	10%
Springhaven Close	17	11	65%	5	45%	6	55%	0	0%	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%
Tormeard Road	69	45	65%	40	89%	5	11%	0	0%	34	76%	11	24%	0	0%
Total	426	218	51%	156	72%	59	27%	2	1%	161	74%	52	24%	3	1%

SATURDAYS

10. There is considerably less parking activity in the area on a Saturday and so the parking bays are more likely to be available for residents. The proposed restrictions will deter vehicles parking too close to driveways, on bends, on footways or in other areas where an obstruction to traffic could be caused. There is adequate parking in each road on a Saturday. Against this a number of residents and organisations have expressed concern that restrictions on Saturdays will be inconvenient and unnecessary.
11. It has been explained at every stage that the proposals include Saturday restrictions. Relatively few representations have been received against Saturday controls and there was clear acceptance of the proposals to introduce the extension.
12. The only place where collective concern has been expressed is Avonmore Avenue where a petition of residents has been submitted. The residents have, however, made clear that in the event that a decision is made against their wishes to include Saturdays they would **not** wish to be excluded from the CPZ. This is the view of 13 out of 15 residents, with 2 households not responding. For this reason, and because of the likely displacement if the scheme is introduced elsewhere it is recommended that Avonmore Avenue is included if the scheme progresses.

13. If the Committee were to consider making a change to the advertised hours of control this is a significant alteration to the proposal that was consulted upon and advertised. The scheme would need to be re-advertised and it would be advisable to carry out consultation prior to advertising. As well as the relative merits of whether restrictions should apply on Saturdays the Committee needs to consider how restrictions that do not include Saturday would be created.
14. A key consideration is the clarity of signing of such restrictions. It is clear from decisions made by parking adjudicators, who determine the validity of penalty charge notices, that simply erecting a statutory sign is not sufficient. An authority has a duty to make any restrictions clear to a motorist. The Local Committee in adopting the Parking Strategy in December 2003 endorsed this by agreeing as an aim to "Sign parking requirements clearly and take steps to avoid the need for parking fines to be issued".
15. To meet this aim the Authority needs to comply with the requirements of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 (TSRGD). The only signs an authority can use to make the restrictions clear are those specified in these regulations or variants, which are specially authorised. The authorisation process can take a considerable length of time and there can be no guarantee of approval being granted.
16. For a Controlled Parking Zone there must be a zone entry sign at each point from which a vehicle can enter the zone. This will state the times between which single yellow lines are restricted. There is normally no further need for signing on single yellow lines. The concept relies on a motorist seeing and remembering the information on the zone entry sign. If the sign is obscured or not prominent the motorist can miss it and will not be aware of the restrictions.
17. The current boundary is very prominent because as well as the entry signs, yellow lines start at the point restrictions start. If there was a Monday to Friday zone next to it then the yellow lines would be continuous and the zone entry signs would appear at an arbitrary point on a busy road. If the new zone was created from the relatively small area being considered for the proposed extension then change between one zone and another would also occur very quickly and this would also make it less likely that the signs would be seen.
18. If such an arrangement was found to be unclear by an adjudicator, it is possible that none of the single yellow lines in the town centre would be enforceable on Saturdays since the most prominent sign for motorists entering Guildford from this direction would be one which said Monday to Friday.

19. There has been a suggestion that the 4-hour bays are changed to only be controlled on Monday to Friday. While this would avoid having to change the zone entry sign and therefore avoid the potential problem above, the arrangement would still be extremely confusing. The single yellow lines which are adjacent to the parking bays would be restricted on Monday to Saturday while the bays themselves would be controlled Monday to Friday. All the signs in the street would say Monday to Friday yet a motorist parking on a single yellow could receive a penalty on a Saturday. Again this arrangement is likely to be deemed confusing and the only way of avoiding it would be to place time plates on every stretch of yellow line to make it clear that they were restricted on Monday to Saturday. This is not practical as some of the yellow lines cross driveways and there is no opportunity for a sign to be erected. It would also have the potential to add considerably to street clutter, a subject on which the Committee has considered recent representations from the Guildford Society and English Heritage.
20. There are significant numbers of unrestricted parking bays which can be used by anyone on a Saturday. Any resident with a resident's parking permit could park all day in a 4-hour bay. If necessary visitors can park for free for up to 4 hours or longer with a visitors permit. Removing the restriction on 4-hour parking bays on a Saturday will only provide a marginal benefit but has the potential to lead to considerable confusion or the need for extra signage, will require the scheme to be re-advertised and will delay its implementation. It recommended for the reasons above that the scheme is introduced with controls from Monday to Saturday for all restrictions except for double yellow lines which would be restricted 24 hours a day.

CRANLEY CLOSE

21. There are strong objections from the residents in the unadopted section of Cranley Close to its inclusion in the Controlled Parking Zone. As an unadopted road it is not highway and the consent of the residents would be needed for the road to be included. It therefore necessary to remove it from the proposals.

CONCLUSION

22. It is not possible to balance all the needs in implementing this scheme as the situation in this area is complicated by a variety of issues. While there are a number of unresolved objections there is considerable support for the scheme. There is a significant problem with vehicles parking in the area and the Orders are required to assist traffic flow, avoid danger and the likelihood of danger both from the existing situation and the likely displacement if restrictions are introduced. It is therefore recommended that the scheme be implemented with the amendments outlined in **ANNEXE 2** but with the exclusion of the unadopted part of Cranley Close.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

23. The cost of implementing the scheme is estimated at £35,000. This will be borne by the CPZ account.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

24. The introduction of the proposed extension to the Controlled Parking Zone will place greater restriction on many who use the area to park when driving to work and serve to discourage journeys to work by car.

LEAD OFFICER	KEVIN MCKEE, PARKING MANAGER GBC
TELEPHONE NUMBER	01483 444530
BACKGROUND PAPERS:	Local Committee Reports: 9 th December 2004 26 th May 2005 21 st July 2005
