



**PARKING IN ASH & ASH VALE**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)**

**14<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2007**

**KEY ISSUE**

The report presents the unresolved objections to the proposals that the Committee agreed to advertise, concerning parking restrictions in Ash and Ash Vale.

**SUMMARY**

16 comments and objections have been received to the proposals for changing and adding to parking restrictions in Ash. **ANNEXE A** of this report summarises the correspondence received. The report recommends implementing the scheme as advertised.

**Report by**

GBC PARKING SERVICES MANAGER

**Surrey Atlas Ref.**

Pages 105 and 106

**GUILDFORD B.C. WARD(S)**

ASH VALE  
ASH WHARF  
ASH SOUTH & TONGHAM

**COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)**

ASH  
SHALFORD

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) that the objections received to the proposed parking restrictions be over-ruled.
- (ii) that the proposed restrictions be confirmed and that the Traffic Regulation Order be made as advertised.

**INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND**

- 1 At its meeting on 27 September 2006 the Committee agreed to consult on proposals for amending and adding to restrictions in the Ash & Ash Vale area. The Committee agreed that these proposals should be put to informal consultation. This initial consultation was conducted between 1 November and 20 November 2006.
- 2 The proposals were promoted on Guildford Borough Council's web site, there was coverage in the local media and street notices were displayed in the areas affected. The proposals were displayed in the Ash Centre between the 6 and 8 November 2006 and officers attended on the afternoon and evening of 8 November to discuss the proposals.
- 3 There were 136 comments resulting from this initial consultation. The comments were discussed with local Members and a report presented to the Local Committee on 22 March 2007. The Committee agreed that subject to certain amendments the proposals should be advertised with a view to making an order to give effect to the proposals.
- 4 The advertisement appeared in the Surrey Advertiser on 27 April 2007 and street notices were erected from this date. The advertisement invited objections which needed to be received by 25 May 2007.

**MAIN ISSUE**

- 5 Officers have been able to resolve or clarify a number of issues raised by people responding to the advertisement. The unresolved objections are detailed in **ANNEXE A** together with the officers' view. This table presents a summary of the comments expressed. The full text is available to any Member of the Committee. Plans of the advertised proposals have not been attached to this report; since no amendments are proposed the plans are identical to those presented to the Committee on 22 March 2007. Further copies are available from officers on request.
- 6 The purpose of the proposals is to improve safety for road users and pedestrians, improve traffic flow, allow parking where safe and practical and improve access for the disabled. There is often a balance to be made between traffic flow and parking and on occasions parking can help to reduce traffic speeds and improve safety.

- 7 The Committee is asked to consider the objections against the aims of the scheme. It is recommended that the Committee reject the objections and agree the scheme be implemented.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 8 The cost of implementing the scheme is estimated at £12,000. This can be funded from the CPZ on-street account.

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 9 The introduction of the proposed restrictions will assist with safety and traffic flow and formalise parking.

---

<b>LEAD OFFICER</b>	KEVIN MCKEE, PARKING MANAGER GBC
<b>TELEPHONE NUMBER</b>	01483 444530
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	Review of Parking in Ash – Guildford Local Committee - 22 <sup>nd</sup> March 2007 Review of Parking Restrictions in areas Outside the Guildford Town CPZ – Guildford Local Committee - 27 <sup>th</sup> September 2006

---

**ITEM 13 : ANNEXE A : SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Name	Comment	Officers' comment and recommendation
Steve Dungay, Rushmoor Borough Council	Proposals are acceptable and Rushmoor BC intend to develop similar controls for its side of the borough ./ county boundary. The only suggested amendment of the proposal would be to extend the double yellow line on the north side of Lynchford, to the west of the level crossing, further west to protect cycleway and footway access, and with relocation of the bus stop, also afford greater protection for it.	Implement the proposals as advertised and review the effect.
Steve Chambers (by e-mail)	Concerned that the proposed restrictions around North Camp station will lead to cars parking in Stratford Road. Believes the problem could be made worse by traffic associated with Holly Lodge School and is concerned that at the start and end of the school day the road could almost become gridlocked.	In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. There is off street parking available, for example, North Camp Station car park normally has unused spaces. Implement the proposals as advertised.
Mr Canning 105 Wentworth Crescent	Concerned that the proposed restrictions still allow parking over a drain near his house and will not allow the road to be swept. Suggests that in the previous year the road could only be swept when there was a railway strike and that the drain blocked three times.	In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. Introducing restrictions simply to facilitate gully emptying and sweeping would be over-restrictive and displace parked vehicles into other streets. Implement the proposals as advertised.
Alexandra Moore Rowberry Morris Solicitors Reading	Objects to the proposals in Lynchford Road as the station car park is not adequate for the number of people travelling by train. No need to impose restrictions and the lack of parking will force people to use their cars to travel to work rather than travel by train.	In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. The present parking causes difficulties for bus services wishing to access the station. There is off street parking available, for example, North Camp Station car park normally has unused spaces. Implement the proposals as advertised.

**ITEM 13 : ANNEXE A : SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Name	Comment	Officers' comment and recommendation
A Farrar 32 Chart House Road	Strongly disagrees with the proposals for Chart House Road. While accepting there is a problem with commuter parking believes that the proposals will disadvantage residents and their visitors. Also believes the proposals will de-value properties. Would only be in favour of a Monday to Friday 2-hour limited waiting restriction.	The formally advertised proposals were amended as a result of the informal consultation. Indeed, the restrictions in the area already controlled by double yellow line restrictions are being relaxed to increase flexibility for residents living in that section of the road. Implement the proposals as advertised.
Mary Tait Wharf Road (by e-mail)	Questions the reason why the proposals have been developed and why there is going to be no provision for residents to park.	Much of the kerb space in Wharf Road will remain uncontrolled and there is unrestricted parking available in nearby car parks, which is available for residents to use. On explaining the proposals, Ms Tait agreed to withdraw her objection. Implement the proposals as advertised.
Roger Hearing 55 Ash Street	Objects to the introducing a 2-hour maximum waiting period on the parking places in Station Approach, Ash Vale. Considers the existing situation to be ideal and that the proposals are unnecessarily oppressive and counter-productive.	The restrictions associated with the parking bays are to assist those wishing to visit the shops and businesses in Station Approach. Areas of single yellow line, operating 7am-10am, will still be available for motorists to park outside these times. Implement the proposals as advertised.
Mr & Mrs Vincent 62 Wentworth Crescent	Believes that the junction protection measures are not as extensive as they should be, and will encourage vehicles to park opposite driveways. Wants the proposed double yellow lines on south side of Wentworth Crescent, west of Wentworth Close to be extended by around 5 metres.	In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. More extensive restrictions, preventing parking opposite driveways would significantly reduce the availability of parking and increase the potential for displacement elsewhere. Implement the proposals as advertised.
Jeffrey Britchford 29 Newfield Road	The introduction of double yellow lines at the junction of Newfield Road and Wentworth Crescent will impact on the ability of visitors to park. The accident history does not warrant junction protection. Believes a permit scheme for residents only would be more appropriate with more (free) parking provided at Ash Vale railway station. Suggest that present laws regarding cycling on the footway and footway parking are not properly enforced, so why introduce additional restrictions.	In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. The remainder of the road will be unrestricted and available for anyone to park. More extensive restrictions, preventing parking preventing commuter parking would significantly reduce the availability of parking and increase the potential for displacement elsewhere. The junction protection measures will enable footway parking to be enforced where the restrictions are present. Implement the proposals as advertised.

**ITEM 13 : ANNEXE A : SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Name	Comment	Officers' comment and recommendation
<p>Mr Grant The Birches, Crescent Lane</p>	<p>Believes that the proposals will exacerbate parking issues in Prospect Road, that the proposed waiting restrictions need to extend to Crescent Lane and Milton Grange and that these are more worthy of attention than those being proposed at the junction of Shawfield Road and Underwood Avenue.</p>	<p>In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. More extensive proposals will not only increase the possibility of displacement elsewhere, but may also have an impact on enforcement resources. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>
<p>Peter Monk Ashwood, Foxhurst Road</p>	<p>Concerned that the proposals will affect commuters, particularly those using the three stations in the area. Considers that commuters using these stations have no alternative but to use private cars to reach the stations and believes that the Council should consider the creation of additional compensatory "off street" parking. All day parking should be provided for in Station Approach. No evidence has been produced to suggest that the proposed restrictions are required. In some of the proposed locations there are no discernable problems, and in other locations, such as around the Swan PH, where restrictions are necessary, no restrictions are proposed. Non-enforcement of the proposed restrictions will bring them into disrepute. The limited waiting restriction around the shops in Wharf Road will adversely affect residents and the hairdresser, although if introduced, it should also be applied to the eastern side of the road.</p>	<p>In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. The proposals at North Camp station were developed to deal with issues caused by parked vehicles for buses serving the railways station. There is off street parking available, for example, North Camp Station car park normally has unused spaces. The same is true in relation to parking in and around Wharf Road. The limited waiting period in the area around the shops and will reduce the likelihood of shoppers having to walk to Coronation Gardens, the latter being available for those with long term parking needs. The limited waiting bays and single yellow lines in Station Approach will accommodate visitors to the shops and businesses, and also facilitate dropping off and picking up. The issues around the Swan PH, like many other pubs, occur at times when there is less traffic. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>
<p>Duncan Page (By e-mail)</p>	<p>Sometimes parks in streets around Ash Vale railway station. The less parking restrictions present the better.</p>	<p>In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. On explaining the proposals, Mr Page agreed to withdraw his objection. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>

**ITEM 13 : ANNEXE A : SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Name	Comment	Officers' comment and recommendation
<p>Ms M Donohoe Party Pants 9b The Parade Wharf Road</p>	<p>Concerned that no provision is being made for shopkeepers and staff of the shops who often have to carry heavy goods and the day's takings. Parking at Coronation Gardens car park would not be safe in winter.</p>	<p>The limited waiting restrictions adjacent to the parade are being proposed to increase the availability of space for customers / visitors to the shops and businesses in the area. The 2-hour limited waiting restriction will allow for the loading and unloading of heavy goods and other purposes. Unrestricted parking will also be available elsewhere. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>
<p>Mr DJE Kallend 29 Wharf Road</p>	<p>The proposals will not solve the traffic problems caused by parking on both sides of Wharf Road. The representation includes a request for advisory driveway protection markings.</p>	<p>In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. Not only would preventing parking on one side of Wharf Road increase the potential for displacement elsewhere, but it may also result in an increase in traffic speeds. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>
<p>Mrs L Day (on behalf of) Mrs E Back 83 Wentworth Crescent</p>	<p>Mrs L Day suggests that her mother Mrs E Back opposes the restrictions on the basis that they will do nothing to resolve the present issues away from junctions and will exacerbate and displace parking further along Wentworth Crescent. The representation includes a request for a disabled bay.</p>	<p>In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. More extensive controls, restricting parking where it is safe to do so, would significantly reduce the availability of parking and increase the potential for displacement elsewhere. The request for the disabled bay will be passed on. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>
<p>David Hall 13 Fairview Road</p>	<p>Objects to the junction protection measures on the basis that it will reduce the amount of parking available, which is already at a premium. Residents living in Ash Hill Road should be prevented from parking in Fairview Road.</p>	<p>In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. A residents' parking scheme is not viable in such a small area, and even if it were, it would not be road specific, so residents of Ash Hill Road would continue to be able to park in Fairview Road. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>

**ITEM 13 : ANNEXE A : SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officers' comment and recommendation</b>
<p>Tim Dixon 31 Wharf Road</p>	<p>Believes that double yellow lines need to be placed adjacent to the lay-by parking bay outside Wheelers Solicitors, to prevent double parking, rather than just formalising the parking bay. Failing to restrict parking across points of private access will result in those with off-street space parking on-street to ensure that they are not blocked in, thereby adding to the parking pressure.</p>	<p>In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. The formalisation of the parking bay outside Wheelers Solicitors will allow enforcement action to be taken against those vehicles that are double-parked. Double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road will maintain and improve sight lines. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>
<p>Stuart Smith 62 Connaught Road Woking</p>	<p>Objects to the present proposals, suggesting that only the restrictions in Lynchford Road closest to the level crossing at North Camp railway station and at its junction with Lysons Avenue are necessary. There are no issues elsewhere within the road, although parking bays could be considered to improve order. There is no facility for dropping off or picking up on the eastern side of the station. The areas of no waiting being proposed may encourage this and rat-running, leading to increased traffic flows, speeds and potential for accidents. Alternative parking facilities need to be provided to deal with the potential displacement.</p>	<p>In general the proposals only restrict parking where it should not occur, such as around bends and at junctions. The proposals at North Camp station were developed to deal with issues caused by parked vehicles for buses serving the railways station. The present parking also often obstructs footways. There is off street parking available, for example, North Camp Station car park normally has unused spaces. Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>