



PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE TO THE EAST

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

8th OCTOBER 2008

KEY ISSUE

The report presents comments and objections received as a result of publishing a formal notice advertising Surrey County Council's intention to make an order extending the Controlled Parking Zone to the east of the town to include St Omer Road, Tangier Road and Warren Road.

SUMMARY

There have been a series of consultation stages to develop an extension to the Controlled Parking Zone. At its meeting in June the Committee agreed to publish an advertisement expressing its intention to make an order giving effect to proposals for an extension to the CPZ. This report details the comments and objections received as a result of that advertisement and recommends implementing the proposal.

Report by

GBC PARKING SERVICES MANAGER

Surrey Atlas Ref.

Pages 130 & 131

GUILDFORD B.C. WARD(S)

CHRISTCHURCH

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

GUILDFORD SOUTH-EAST

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) that the objections received to the proposed extension to the Controlled Parking Zone as set out in the plan attached as **ANNEXE 3** be not supported.
- (ii) that the proposed restrictions be confirmed and that the Traffic Regulation Order be made as advertised.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1 An extension of the CPZ came into force on 3 April 2006 covering much of the area bounded by Aldersey Road, London Road, Boxgrove Road and Epsom Road and also included Broadwater Rise.
- 2 As part of the implementation process the residents of Tangier Road and St Omer Road had been consulted on whether they wanted to be included in the CPZ. In Tangier Road there was strong opposition and in St Omer Road there was no clear support. Nonetheless officers were concerned there could be displacement and plans were drawn up for St Omer Road and Tangier Road. The concerns were emphasised to residents and options for controls included in the consultation on the design of the proposed scheme. During this consultation there was no marked change in views.
- 3 The scheme was implemented without controls in either St Omer or Tangier Roads, although junction protection measures were introduced. Once the controls in adjacent streets took effect there was significant displacement into St Omer Road and requests from residents for an extension of the scheme.
- 4 At its meeting on 14 June 2007 the Committee agreed to consult with residents on whether St Omer Road, Tangier Road, Rosetrees and Warren Road should be included in the CPZ. The results were reported to the Committee on 27 September 2007. A summary of the results is attached as **ANNEXE 1**. The Committee agreed to conduct further consultation on a design for an extension to include St Omer Road, Tangier Road and Warren Road but not Rosetrees.
- 5 The consultation on the design ran from 23 November 2007 to 21 December 2007. Letters were sent to all residents in affected roads and also the parts of Downside and One Tree Hill Road closest to the area under consideration. The Rosetrees and private roads adjoining St Omer Road, Tangier and Warren Road were also sent details. The letters included an A3 map showing the proposed layout. There was a form to help structure replies and a post paid envelope. The proposals were advertised on the web. In addition an exhibition was held at Burchetts Barn on 4 December 2007.

- 6 At its meeting in June 2008 the Committee considered the comments and agreed to formally advertise the intention to make an order to give effect to the proposal. The only change to the original proposal was to extend the double yellow lines in Tangier and St Omer Roads at their junction with Epsom Road by approximately one car length. This report presents the comments and objections received as a result of the advertisement.

ANALYSIS

- 7 **ANNEXE 2** contains details of the comments and objections raised to the scheme. The scheme has already been subject to detailed consultation and most of the responses raise themes, which have been considered before. The formal objections need full consideration and Members of the Committee wishing to see the full file should contact the Parking Services Manager.

Junctions

- 8 Many of the responses suggest increasing the length of double yellow lines at the Tangier Road/Epsom Road junction and at the Warren Road/Tangier Road junction. Officers are satisfied that the proposals will work and that there is a suitable balance between prohibited and permitted parking. Extending yellow lines and removing parking is likely to lead to further displacement and increase the spread of the issue.

Position of Bays

- 9 A number of the responses relate to the position or type of bay designated. Where there is an issue raised about sight lines or ability to manoeuvre out of driveways officers have re-examined the site. The detailed officer responses in **ANNEXE 2** answer each point but clearly residents would prefer to have 4-hour limited waiting near their house rather than unrestricted spaces.

Upper Tangier Road

- 10 There are a number of objections from Upper Tangier Road concerning the inclusion of that part of the road within the Controlled Parking Zone. The inclusion of the whole on Tangier Road and unrestricted part of Warren Road was recommended because of the risk of displacement if controls are implemented in St Omer Road. There have been a series of situations in this area where roads have been omitted from the CPZ because the residents did not believe they would experience displacement parking.
- 11 To omit the upper part of Tangier Road if the lower part and Warren Road were controlled would create an unrestricted gap in the CPZ. It would cause confusion for motorists. A Controlled Parking Zone is marked by entry and exit signs on its boundaries. Cars coming from One Tree Hill Road would first pass an entry sign as they entered Warren Road, then an exit sign as they turned into Tangier Road and then another entry sign as they entered Lower Tangier Road, all within a very short distance.

OPTIONS

- 12 The previous consultations have helped develop the proposal and highlighted concerns. In June 2008 the Committee agreed to advertise its intention to make an order to give effect to the proposal to extend the Controlled Parking Zone to include St Omer Road, Tangier road and the uncontrolled part of Warren Road. However because any proposal has to be formally advertised, the scope to make changes is very limited at this stage without re-advertising a changed scheme.
- 13 The Committee has the following three options:
- (a) agree the scheme as advertised,
 - (b) agree the scheme with very minor amendments,
 - (c) make changes and re-advertise new proposals.
- 14 In coming to the decision the Committee needs to consider the objections and comments in **ANNEXE 2**. Some of the comments have been summarised and some included photographs. Any Member of the Committee who wishes to see the full submission should contact the Parking Services Manager.

CONSULTATIONS

- 15 There have been three levels of consultation so far. First, residents of the roads within the area concerned were asked whether there was a parking problem and whether they wanted their road included in a CPZ extension. Then there was detailed consultation on the potential design of the scheme. As well as residents, non-resident motorists were invited to participate at this second stage. The results of this stage of the consultation were reported to the Committee in June 2008.
- 16 The third part of the process was to advertise the intention to make an order giving effect to the proposals. An advertisement was placed in the Surrey Advertiser on 4 July 2008 inviting comments and objections by 1 August 2008. Street notices were placed in the roads affected by the proposal and residents in the area and in Downside Road and in the part of One Tree Hill Road adjoining the area were written to directly.

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 17 The scheme is estimated to cost £6,000 to implement. This can be met from the on-street account. This estimate is approximate, and covers the cost of revised signage and road markings as well as the cost of making the order. It applies to both options (i) and (ii) in paragraph 13 above. If option (iii) is pursued there will be additional consultation and advertisement costs. None of these estimates includes the cost of officer time, since this would be incurred in any case. However if further time is spent on these proposals, the effect will be to delay consideration of parking problems elsewhere.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

18 There are no equality or diversity implications.

CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

19 There are no crime and disorder implications.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

20 The issues raised in the responses to the formal advertisement mainly raise issues which emerged from the initial consultation and have been discussed.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

21 To give effect to an extension to the Controlled Parking Zone to control parking in St Omer Road, Tangier Road and Warren Road. The extension will promote a better balance in the use of kerbside space and ensure easier traffic flow particularly around junctions.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

22 An order will be made and the scheme will be implemented. It is expected to go live by the end of the current financial year.

LEAD OFFICER	KEVIN MCKEE GBC PARKING SERVICES MANAGER
TELEPHONE	01483 444530
CONTACT OFFICER	ANDREW HARKIN GBC ON STREET CO-ORDINATOR
TELEPHONE	01483 444535
BACKGROUND PAPERS	NONE

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 1 : SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 2007 CONSULTATION RESULTS

Road	No. of Addressees	Response	% of properties returning survey	Q1 - Do you perceive there is a parking problem in your road? (% of responses from the road)						Q2 - Do you think your road should be included within any extension to the CPZ?						Q3 - If controls in adjacent roads were likely to significantly increase parking in your road would you want your road to be included in the CPZ?					
				Yes		No		No View		Yes		No		No View		Yes		No		No View	
				No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Kyngeshene Gardens (p)	10	4	40%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
Rosetrees	59	21	36%	9	43%	12	57%	0	0%	6	29%	12	57%	3	14%	11	52%	6	29%	4	19%
St Omer Ridge (p)	5	1	20%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
St Omer Road	30	22	73%	18	82%	4	18%	0	0%	18	82%	4	18%	0	0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tangier Road	40	27	68%	16	59%	11	41%	0	0%	12	44%	14	52%	1	4%	17	63%	8	30%	2	7%
The Ridgeway (p)	12	8	67%	0	0%	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	5	63%	3	38%
Warren Road	45	17	68%	5	29%	12	71%	0	0%	6	35%	9	53%	2	12%	10	59%	4	24%	3	18%
Overall *not including St Omer Road	201	100	50%	50	50%	48	48%	2	2%	44	44%	48	48%	8	8%	41	53%	25	32%	12	15%
Overall (excluding private roads) *not including St Omer Road	174	87	50%	48	55%	39	45%	0	0%	42	48%	39	45%	6	7%	38	58%	18	28%	9	14%

(p) denotes a private road

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
1	John Wortt, 23 Rosetrees, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HS	Further to previous objections, no-one believes the proposals bring any benefits, and by reducing the availability of parking will simply move the problem elsewhere. There generally are no problems in Tangier, Warren and St Omer Roads but issues will occur if the proposals go ahead. The formalisation of parking in Warren Road will needlessly reduce the amount of space available by 5 cars in the section between Rosetrees and Tangier Rd and lead to displacement into Rosetrees. The proposed extension of the restrictions at the bottom of Tangier Road are of merit but other than this please leave things as they are.	Many residents support the introduction of formalised controls in the area. While restrictions may prevent drivers parking too close to junctions or access points they create a better balance in the use of the road. The CPZ already extends past Rosetrees and we do not consider there will be significant displacement into the road.
2	Mr J Martin, 'Beechfield', 54 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HH	Proposals grievously disappointing. The protection of the Tangier Road / Warren Road junction remains inadequate. The introduction of SYLs suggests that the danger only exists between 8.30am-6pm. Parking should not be allowed opposite driveways.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from the junction. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. Warren Road is sufficiently wide to permit parking opposite driveways, and where it can and does already take place without restriction.
3	Robert F Smyth, 3 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DE	Whilst broadly in agreement with the proposals, object to the unrestricted parking bay nearest the junction with Epsom Road which is still too close and will cause problems, and likewise with the bay nearest the junction with Warren Road.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The parking bay on Tangier Road closest to the junction with Warren Road is 15m away from the junction and because of the proximity of Kyngeshene Gardens access extensive additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. We consider these measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.
4	Mrs Margaret Thompson, 1 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DE	There should be no parking allowed at either end of this busy road for safety reasons. The turn from Warren Road is very sharp and with a car parked near the junction presents an unnecessary hazard. The danger at the Epsom Road junction is perhaps greater. Cars turn in sharply and with a parked car can be met by a car or a lorry in the middle of the road with a queue of cars behind. Parked vehicles also cause issues for residents that live near the junctions. The likelihood of a serious accident would be lessened if yellow lines were added up to the first two drives on both sides of the road.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The parking bay on Tangier Road closest to the junction with Warren Road is 15m away from the junction and because of the proximity of Kyngeshene Gardens access extensive additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. We consider these measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
5	Dr Bayliss, 58 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HH	Support the positioning and size of the proposed unrestricted bays in Warren Road, but would prefer to see more unrestricted parking in St Omer Road and Tangier road to minimise displacement, and further extensions to the proposed DYs at the bottom of both roads.	<p>The proportioning of the bays in St Omer Road and Tangier Road already provides significant amounts of unrestricted parking in those roads whilst also prioritising areas for residents and their visitors. We consider this will achieve the right balance. The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest.</p> <p>The parking bay on Tangier Road closest to the junction with Warren Road is 15m away from the junction and because of the proximity of Kyngeshene Gardens access extensive additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. We consider these measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.</p>
6	Drs Katherine & Andrew Pink, 4 Kyngeshene Gardens, GUILDFORD	Wholly disagree with the proposal. Not only will the controls have a detrimental visual impact on a beautiful residential region but also the lack of permit eligibility for residents of private roads will make it difficult for them and their visitors, particularly those with young children or the elderly. These views are shared by everyone on the development.	The objective of the proposals is to order parking particularly from non-residents across the area so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Signs will be kept to a minimum and sensitively positioned. Residents of private roads, which do not form part of the public highway or the controlled parking zone are not eligible for permits. To accommodate their needs, the spaces in the immediate vicinity of Kyngeshene Gardens are unrestricted to enable residents there to use them without restriction.
7	Ms Julia Plunkett, 10 Kyngeshene Gardens, GUILDFORD	Concerned about lack of permit eligibility for residents of Kyngeshene Gardens (private).	Residents of private roads, which do not form part of the public highway or the controlled parking zone are not eligible for permits. To accommodate their needs, the spaces in the immediate vicinity of Kyngeshene Gardens are unrestricted to enable residents there to use them without restriction.
8	Mr & Mrs Langley, 'Hilgay', 50 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HG	There are two points that should be considered before the scheme is introduced: The unrestricted spaces in Warren Road opposite Nos.48-50 should be 4-hour limited waiting to prevent all-day parking and, larger vehicles such as vans and campervans should be prevented from using the spaces.	The objective of the proposals is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area. Presently all-day parkers generally use the uncontrolled areas in Warren Road during the day. If some of these spaces were prioritised for shorter-stay users and residents, this would increase the possibility of displacement all-day parkers elsewhere. The parking bays will be a maximum of 2 metres wide, and vehicles within them limited to 5-tonnes in weight. Whilst this will not preclude their use by larger vehicles such as vans and caravanettes, it will prevent larger vehicles, such as HGVs, using the spaces.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
9	Mrs A P Monks, 'Toft House', 13 Downside Road, GUILDFORD, GU4 8PH	Parking should not be allowed in Warren Road either side of the junction with Tangier Road as the present visibility at this junction is poor due to parking and consequently dangerous for cyclists, pedestrians and drivers. Therefore, a decision to allow more parking is illogical and dangerous and should be rescinded for safety reasons. The situation at the bottom of Tangier Road at its junction with Epsom Road is also dangerous and parking should not be allowed on both sides. There is not room for cars to pass.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from the junction. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction in Warren Road will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The spaces proposed in Warren Road are situated away from junctions and points of access, and where it can be safely accommodated, unlike the present situation, which is uncontrolled. At the junction of Epsom Road and Tangier Road parking will only be permitted on one side of the road between 8.30 and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. We consider this will overcome the present problems and allow two-way traffic flow.
10	Mr & Mrs DG & SM Peters, 30 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	As far as road safety is concerned the proposals for the top part of Tangier Road are unsatisfactory. The proposed bays should be on the east side of the road to ensure traffic coming into Tangier Road from Warren Road has a clear view of the cars already parked in Tangier Road. Vehicles coming from the top end of Warren Road frequently cut the corner. Vehicles coming from the lower end of Warren Road turning left into Tangier Road have restricted vision. Bays on the east side would be nearer the new Kyngeshene properties whose parking facilities are inadequate. The houses on the east side are protected from the road by high hedges whereas on the west there are open frontages. Do not consider controlled parking is necessary in upper Tangier Road and if bays must be added they should be limited to 4 hour waiting Mon to Sat.	The spaces are proposed on the western side of the road to afford greater visibility for vehicles exiting Kyngeshene Gardens into Tangier Road. Additionally, by having the bays on the western side, and whilst still allowing two-way flow, priority is given to those vehicles driving up the hill. This combined with the bays further down Tangier Road create a chicane effect, which may assist in calming traffic. It would be confusing to omit upper Tangier Rd if Warren Road and lower Tangier Road are controlled. In addition we consider there will be displacement into the upper part of Tangier Rd if the dense parking in St Omer is regulated.
11	Peter & Elizabeth Wix, 'Crockett House', Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	It is essential that the yellow lines at both ends of Tangier Road are substantially increased as parking whether on one or both sides is dangerous. Cars backed up trying to get onto the Epsom Road make it impossible for emergency vehicles to get through. At the Warren Road end cars parked on one or both sides make it very difficult to see on coming cars turning into Tangier Road. The restriction on the parking bays should not apply on Saturdays or Sundays. All residents of Tangier Road should be entitled to parking permits regardless of their off-street parking provision.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the eastern side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. At the Warren Road end extensive additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. Residents of Tangier Road, like those within the existing area of Area I will be entitled to one residents' permit irrespective of their off-street facilities. The existing CPZ is restricted Monday to Saturday. Similarly, concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but have not proved to be a problem. There are no proposals to restrict Sunday parking. The proposed measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
12	Mr & Mrs Hummel, 8 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Strongly support proposed double yellow lines in Tangier Road although suggest that those at the junction with Epsom Road should be extended by a lorry-length rather than a car-length.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest.
13	T & A Carney, 13 St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, 2DA	My wife and I wish to register an objection to this proposal. We see no need for the extension which will have a detrimental effect on our ability to park outside our own home. Your data is flawed in that the surveys were undertaken during a period when building works were ongoing. Parking has now returned to normal. If the scheme does proceed, the bays should be more conveniently located for our property.	The suggestion that there is no need for the extension is not the majority view expressed previously by residents of St Omer Road. The combination of unrestricted and 4-hour limited waiting bays spread throughout the road, albeit on the even numbered side, should provide ample opportunity for residents and their visitors to park.
14	Brigid Jackson, jackson@kingstonhospital.nhs.uk	Happy with proposals to improve safety around the junctions but do not see the need for 4 hour restricted parking bays so far from the town centre as there is little parking and no problems. It will have an adverse affect on residents who only have one parking space and may have to park a second car on the road at times. If permit charges are introduced it just seems a means by which the council can obtain more money from residents.	There is a substantial amount of non-residents parking in St Omer Road and one objective of the proposal is to regulate this and spread it over a wider area. If this parking is allowed to displace naturally, without being properly managed, issues can arise in the nearest uncontrolled sections of carriageway, as occurred previously when the scheme was introduced in roads adjacent to St Omer Road. Residents will not necessarily need permits, as there are unrestricted parking places and 4 hour limited bays.
15	John H Rowe, 23 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Support the proposals with the exception of the parking bay at the bottom of Tangier Road. The parking which already takes place there often causes a queue of traffic waiting to get onto Epsom Road. Cars need to pull out directly into the path of vehicles entering Tangier Road, which to them is a blind corner.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest.
16	Patricia East, Mzima Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HQ	Rate payers living in the roads affected are having their residential area turned into a free car park. Whilst residents of St Omer Road maybe pleased by the proposal the problem is merely being moved around the corner. Traffic speeds up and down Warren Road making it increasingly difficult to exit properties safely and the parked cars make it more difficult. The plan to increase the DYs at the bottom of Tangier Road is necessary, the proposed yellow line restrictions should be extended from Tangier Road to One Tree Hill Road.	One objective of the proposal is to spread the non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in roads like St Omer Road are resolved. Nevertheless, road space has to be managed equitably for all road users, whether they are residents or not. Warren Road is sufficiently wide between Tangier Road and One Tree Hill to allow parking. If this area were restricted throughout, the potential for displacement into Downside Road would increase, and would vehicle speeds. The proposed spaces in this section, if occupied, may also assist in respect to traffic calming.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
17	D & J Cade, Michaelmas House 28 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	There is no need to extend the CPZ to include upper Tangier Road as there simply isn't a problem. Nevertheless, we are please with the proposal to extend the DYs at both the top and bottom. However, if the proposals do go ahead the unrestricted bays at the top should be converted to 4-hour limited waiting and swapped to the eastern side of the road with its higher hedges, to minimise visual intrusion.	One objective of the proposals is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in roads like St Omer Road are resolved. We consider that if parking is controlled in St Omer Road and the Lower part of Tangier Road there will be an increase in parking in upper Tangier Road. It would be confusing to exclude upper Tangier Road if the lower part and Warren Road was included.
18	Mr & Mrs S & B Parker, 1 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Strongly against inclusion of Tangier Road as there is not a problem. The number of cars parked in Tangier Road is low and we do not believe that there will be sufficient displacement parking to create a problem. We have done counts and the numbers are low. Making the CPZ extension and policing it is costly and a waste. There should be no costs attached with visitor parking and the markings and signs will detract from the appearance of the road. Whilst St Omer Road and some in lower Tangier Road support inclusion, upper Tangier Road should be excluded. 14 of the 18 residents in upper Tangier Road oppose the scheme but their views have been ignored. The scheme should not be imposed and the practical solution is to exclude the upper part of Tangier Road.	One objective of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Resolving these issues and improving the situation around junctions, through the formalisation of parking, invariably reduces the amount of parking available. If this parking is allowed to displace naturally, without being properly managed, issues can arise in the nearest uncontrolled sections of carriageway, as occurred previously when the scheme was introduced in roads adjacent to St Omer Road. If uncontrolled, the section of Tangier Road between St Omer Road and Warren Road would be most at risk. It would also be confusing to exclude upper Tangier Road if the lower part and Warren Road was included. Although a useful means of gauging opinion and identifying potential issues, the informal and formal stages of consultation are not a referendum on parking. The highway authority is tasked with the managing the public highway in an equitable manner and in the best interests of all road users.
19	Dr R Seebold, 6 St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DB	Completely against the extension as there isn't a serious problem in St Omer Road. There will be no benefit for residents of the road, and the inclusion of Saturdays is completely unnecessary.	The suggestion that there is no need for the extension and it will be of no benefit to residents is not a widely held view in St Omer Road. Indeed many residents, including the representee, took the previous opportunity to have a driveway protection marking placed across the entrance to their driveway. Concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but there has not been a problem. The proposed measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.
20	T & MA Lux, Morston, St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DB	Support the proposals as the character and nature of the road has changed significantly since the previous extension, with non-resident vehicles consistently parking in the road. Problems have included blocked driveways, loss of sightlines whilst existing driveways and driving along the road, nowhere for residents to park, cars being dumped, increased risk of injury for pedestrians and single file traffic increases the risk of traffic accidents. Representation I have made to SEEDA, SCC and other companies whose staff park in St Omer Road have had little or no effect, and the subsequently introduced driveway protection markings have been ineffective. The redevelopment of the DEFRA site will only exacerbate issues. Please implement ASAP.	Noted

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
21	John & Doreen Yaxley, 'Tinkers Wood', 29 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Having lived in the road for nearly 40 years the situation has deteriorated. The nature of the road encourages speeding. The 4-hour parking bays being proposed should be repositioned as they affect sightlines and will add further danger for those exiting adjacent properties. Therefore, the number of parking bays should be reduced by removing those close to driveways.	Whilst still allowing two-way flow, the proposed parking bays have been arranged so as to create chicanes, which may assist in calming traffic. The bays will be setback sufficiently from driveways, as is the case elsewhere throughout the existing CPZ.
22	Julia & Juan Coto, 'Walnut Lodge', 9 St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DA	Strongly in favour of the proposals to extend the CPZ into St Omer Road and nearby roads. The present situation raises safety issues, making it difficult to exit driveways because of the level of parking in the road.	Noted
23	Mr & Mrs D Varns, 5 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Agrees with the proposals and would like to see a balance of 4-hour and all day bays, DYLS at the exit of The Ridgeway, and extended DYLS at Tangier Roads junctions with Epsom Road and Warren Road.	We consider the proposal offers these elements.
24	Ms Helen Bernard, 33 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HQ	Concerned about the affects of the proposals on the basis that they share a driveway with No.31a and this results in up to 6 vehicles using the driveway daily. This is significantly more than for an average property, and as a result, the position of the proposed parking bays and displacement from elsewhere will make the present, extremely dangerous situation, even worse. DYLS should protect visibility at the junction and around points of access to at least Downlands. Failure to do so will lead to accidents and injury. Could the Police carry out speed checks?	The proposed parking bays are set back 1.8m on each side from the edge of the driveway. We have visited the area and assessed the situation and consider this is sufficient.
25	Mr B & Mrs C Dilbey, 'Kingsworthy', 26 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Strongly agrees with the need for the extension of the DYLS and SYLS at Tangier Road's junctions with Epsom and Warren Road, also those in St Omer Road and at the entrance of The Ridgeway. Does not think that the top of Tangier Rd should be restricted at this stage but feels the restriction on parking at the lower end could lead to traffic migrating to the top end and causing a problem when the DEFRA site is developed. The proposed SYLS do not protect driveways in the evenings and on Sundays. The unrestricted parking bays also allow cars to be 'dumped' for unlimited periods.	One of the objectives of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in road St Omer Road are resolved. We estimate this is likely to lead to displacement parking in the top part of Tangier Road. It would be confusing for motorists to leave the top of Tangier Road unrestricted if the lower part and Warren Rd had restrictions. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm single yellow line restrictions, prevent parking when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. There is always a small risk cars will become abandoned but this could occur now.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
26	Mr & Mrs E Tyers, 'Ravenswood', 22 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	<p>Do not want to see any extension of the CPZ into Tangier Road and strongly question if there is a need for such measures as there is currently no parking problem. Disagrees with the surveys in previous Committee reports suggesting that the closure of DEFRA has had little impact parking on levels of parking. Contends that there is no longer a parking issue. Enclosed a number of photographs taken on Saturday 5th July and Tuesday 8th July. Suggests another yes / no survey is conducted now the DEFRA site has closed to ask whether residents believe there is a problem. Residents also need to be made aware of the cost of permits, restrictions on visitor permits etc... as this has not been communicated. Despite the above, if the proposals do go ahead, they should only apply Monday-Friday.</p>	<p>One of the objectives of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Parking levels in St Omer Road have remained similar since the closure of DEFRA, so if it remained uncontrolled, Tangier Road would be most at risk from displacement. Concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but have proved unfounded. A leaflet explaining the permit scheme and permit charges was included with the informal consultation letter distributed in July 2007.</p>
27	Andrew Whiddett, 41 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	<p>It seems almost inevitable that this unnecessary scheme is foisted upon us. Concerned about the environmental impact of street furniture, notices and bright yellow lines. The extension of the junction protection measures is proportional and appropriate. The amount of unrestricted parking allowed at the top end of Tangier Road and Warren Road is grossly inadequate for the flats in Warren Road and from the sale and redevelopment of old house potentially into higher density flats. The proposals reduce parking space when this will increase demand. The proposals will merely displace the problem, as they have done so before, and will greatly inconvenience residents, visitors and trades people. Parking would be almost continuous if moved to the east side of the road rather than the west, although the existing parking on both side should be allowed to remain. If the purpose of the proposal is to stop commuters from parking in St Omer Road, why not adopt an 11am-2pm commuter ban, and remove Saturdays from the scheme. The random parking in Tangier Road presently calms traffic. This benefit will be lost through formalisation. The proposals will also have a detrimental visual impact. The Council should not charge residents for permits and use of the spaces. Resolving a minor issue in St Omer Road should not mess my road up too. High density development and multi-car ownership has to be accommodated.</p>	<p>One of the objectives of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Parking is likely to displace into Tangier Road and controls are needed to ensure there are not problems. The spaces are proposed on the western side of the road in this section to afford greater visibility for vehicles exiting Kyngeshene Gardens into Tangier Road. Additionally, by having the bays on the western side, and whilst still allowing two-way flow, priority is given to those vehicles driving up the hill. This combined with the bays further down Tangier Road create a chicane effect, which may assist in calming traffic. Commuter bans only tend to be introduced around railways stations, where the commuters have no means of returning to their vehicles during the day. It also places additional burdens on enforcement by requiring it to be undertaken in specific locations at specific times. It could increase the likelihood of vehicles parking on both sides of the roads, particularly around junctions when the commuter ban isn't in force, whereas the no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restrictions would prevent parking in these areas throughout the period when traffic flows are generally greater. A commuter ban would increase the need for signing and consequently the visual impact. Although the use of road markings is unavoidable, signs will be kept to a minimum and sensitively positioned. Concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but have not proved to be a problem. The permit charges cover the cost of administering the scheme and the proposals accommodate present demand and potential issues.</p>

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
28	Elizabeth Whiddett 41 Tangier Road GUILDFORD GU1 2DF	Cars park in the lower part of St Omer Road but the upper does not have a problem. There is not a problem in the lower part of Tangier Rd. Parking may have increased as a result of restrictions in adjacent roads but never felt that it represents a danger. Extending the CPZ will move the problem and cause issues in areas that do not have a problem. If parking were stopped in lower St Omer Road and cars distributed between upper St Omer and Tangier Rds there would not be a problem. Residents in Upper Tangier Rd and Warren Rd have a need for parking on street. The inconvenience the scheme will cause them needs to be balanced against the scale of the problem. The problem is being moved closer to the Surrey Hills which are attractive for their lack of lines. The cost also needs to be considered. Does not see the need to extend lines at the Tangier / Warren Rd junction as people park safely but if experts considered it was would not object to this part only.	Parking problems in St Omer Road have been highlighted and the scheme has been designed to deal with these. The proposed restriction will cause displacement in to adjacent roads and the controls seek to control this to ensure a balance between unrestricted parking and limited parking which can be used by residents and their visitors. We have looked at the levels of parking in the area and consider the controls are needed. To avoid moving the problem of displaced uncontrolled parking that occurred in St Omer Road.
29	Mr J Rule, 'Fairwinds', 29 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HG	This representation is made on safety grounds. Although welcoming the proposed SYL from Warren Road's junction with Tangier Road and across No.29s driveway, protest that its length is insufficiently short and does not provide safe access out of the drive. The SYL needs to be extended by a car length towards Rosetrees. An additional car length would have no impact on residents or non-residents. The representation has been made on the basis that despite concerted efforts having been made to resolve the issues on an informal basis no progress has resulted. There has been a history of safety issues on either side of our drive. Vans are a particular problem and Surrey Police consider those that park in close proximity to the driveway (where they will be formally allowed) to be causing danger / obstruction. The proposed SYLs take no account of the specific circumstances. Our safety has not been considered or supported by the Council, and representative are invited to undertake a site visit. Formal action will be taken if representation is declined to protect the safety of our family.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from the junction. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. We have visited the site and are satisfied that the bay will be setback sufficiently from the driveway. The parking bays will be a maximum of 2 metres wide, and vehicles within them limited to 5-tonnes in weight. Whilst this will not preclude their use by larger vehicles such as vans and caravanettes, it will prevent larger vehicles, such as HGVs, using the spaces.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
30	Mr Chris Shorter, Thomasons, 86 Epsom Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2BX	Oppose the proposal for all the same reasons expressed previously. The proposals are a direct consequence of previous actions in adjacent roads and central governments desire to displace motorists onto non-existent public transport. It would be more useful for you to 'target' driving schools who use this road despite the test centre having close, and who regularly 'dump' unused cars. If controls are introduced some logic should be employed and that parking should be prevented in the unlimited bays before 9.30 or 10am and Saturday should be omitted. The suggestion that Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm should be employed does not hold water. Those who park in the area are local regulars, so they would only be confused once by non-standard restrictions.	One objective of the proposal is to spread the non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. The previous extension of the scheme was introduced to deal with safety issues and at the request of residents in those locations. The needs of all motorists have to be considered in an equitable manner. Commuter bans tend to be introduced around railways stations, where the commuters have no means of returning to their vehicles during the day. It also places additional burdens on enforcement by requiring it to be undertaken in specific locations at specific times. It could increase the likelihood of vehicles parking on both sides of the roads, particularly around junctions when the commuter ban isn't in force, whereas the no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restrictions would prevent parking in these areas throughout the period when traffic flows are generally greater. A commuter ban would increase the need for signing and consequently the visual impact. Concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but have not been a problem.
31	Richard Sinker, 2 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD	Strongly support proposed double yellow lines in Tangier Road in vicinity of The Ridgeway as intermittent speeding and poor sightlines in Tangier Road continue to cause issues when exiting The Ridgeway.	Noted.
32	Colin Mealor, 16 Rosetrees, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HS	In relation to the junction of Rosetrees and Warren Road, the DYLS need to be extended much further to improve sight lines and the proposed first parking bay should be removed and bus stop relocated to that area. In respect to the junction of Tangier Road and Warren Road this junction also suffers from poor sight lines. There should be no parking bays prior to the first driveway to the left, so the first proposed parking bay should be removed. Additionally, the DYLS to the right should be extended much further to protect the access and No.29 and movements at the junction.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from both the Rosetrees and Tangier Road junctions. In both cases proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The spaces proposed in Warren Road will be situated away from junctions and points of access, and where it can be safely accommodated, unlike the present situation, which is uncontrolled.
33	Ian & Helen Wells, 3 Rosetrees, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HS	This is the 6th opportunity we have had to write regarding the above! Whilst supportive of certain elements of the proposals, such as the principal of improved junction protection, concerned that DYLS have not been used to extend the junction protection in Warren Road. The inconsiderate parking in Warren Road is often worst in the evenings and at weekends. Therefore the precedent of DYLS set in Tangier Road should be extended to Warren Road. Additionally, Rosetrees must be included in the scheme, with at least the upper half involved, due to the present obstruction of driveways, the difficulties caused to residents who have visitors and carers, the lack of access for emergency vehicles caused by parked vehicles, breaches in the restrictive covenants on the houses and the disturbance caused by on-street parking late at night.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from both the Rosetrees and Tangier Road junctions. In both cases the proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The spaces proposed in Warren Road will be situated away from junctions and points of access, and where it can be safely accommodated, unlike the present situation, which is uncontrolled. The residents, and not non-resident motorists, principally cause the parking issues in Rosetrees. The introduction of the parking scheme during the day would have little impact in dealing with these issues.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
34	David & Rosalind Hanna, 37 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Oppose the proposal in upper Tangier Road on the basis that it will compromise the safety of residents, particularly small children, living in Kyngeshene Gardens. If non-residents park in the unrestricted bays in upper Tangier Road, there will be no space for residents' with two cars, their visitors or tradesmen. This may tempt people to park within the development, increasing danger there and difficulties for emergency vehicles if access were required. Therefore it is important that residents of the development have reasonable access to parking on the public highway and be eligible for permits. Kyngeshene Gardens must be reclassified as a shared access and not a private road, to avoid a situation where some of the properties in the development are eligible for permits whilst others are not. Additionally, one of the nearby parking bays should be prioritised for permit holders.	One objective of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Resolving these issues and improving the situation around junctions, through the formalisation of parking, invariably reduces the amount of parking available. If this parking is allowed to displace naturally, without being properly managed, issues can arise in the nearest uncontrolled sections of carriageway, as occurred previously when the scheme was introduced in roads adjacent to St Omer Road. If uncontrolled, the section of Tangier Road between St Omer Road and Warren Road would be most at risk. Because of the proximity of Kyngeshene Gardens' access to Warren Road, additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. Nevertheless unrestricted spaces are proposed on the western side of the road in this section to afford greater visibility for vehicles exiting Kyngeshene Gardens into Tangier Road. These will be available for residents of Kyngeshene Gardens to use. Management of parking within Kyngeshene Gardens would be a matter for the organisation responsible for managing that area.
35	John Twining, 8a The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Supportive of the proposal for double yellow lines in Tangier Road at the exit from The Ridgeway. Disappointed that the double yellow lines at the Tangier Road junction with Epsom Road are only proposed to be lengthened by one cars length. Does not think this is sufficient to overcome the road safety problems arising from competition between vehicles from Tangier Road seeking to turn into Epsom Road and vehicles travelling westward along Epsom Road seeking to turn into Tangier Road. A further extension of the double yellow lines in Tangier Road would reduce this road safety problem.	We have studied the junction Tangier Road/Epsom Road junction. The proposed double yellow lines will extend 20 metres and consider that introducing a single yellow line on the east side will improve access.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
36	John Twining, On behalf of the Downsedge Residents Association 8a The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	<p>Views of members of the association differ according to the area in which they live. St Omer Road members want the scheme implemented as soon as possible. In Lower Tangier Road the majority of residents recognise this area is likely to suffer displacement and support inclusion. However residents and road users are disappointed that only a small extension to the double yellow lines at the junction with Epsom Road is proposed. Vehicles turning in and out the roads are forced into the middle by the angle of the junction. The small extension will not stop this as it occurs when vehicles are parked two spaces from the current double yellow lines. In upper Tangier Road we understand that there is virtually unanimous opposition to the inclusion of this length of road in the CPZ. This stretch of road is very steep which may deter commuter or shopping parkers. The present uncontrolled pattern of parking suggests an overflow of domestic parking from the Kyngeshene development. We are concerned that the evidence of "snapshots" of parking as presented at the local Committee on 18 June, i.e. four morning counts does not provide a full picture of the situation on the ground. Some residents in upper Tangier Road have also asked that if the CPZ is to be extended to this stretch of road that the unrestricted parking place closest to Warren Road be eliminated as it will force traffic turning into Tangier Road into the middle of the road. Residents have also asked that the unrestricted parking bays proposed for the west side of the road be moved to the east.</p> <p>The Ridgeway are in favour of the proposed double yellow lines in Tangier Road at the exit from the Ridgeway.</p> <p>In Warren Road the residents want longer double yellow lines at the Warren Rd/Tangier Rd junction as the angle is particularly difficult. Parking in Tangier Road along the flank wall of No 29 Warren Rd exacerbates the situation.</p>	<p>The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. Similarly, the no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres in Warren Road from its junction with Tangier Road. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The upper part of Tangier Road is likely to have displacement parking. The omission of the upper part of Tangier Road will be confusing for motorists. The 4-hour bays are generally located centrally within the road, so that if certain spaces become fully occupied, the alternative prioritised spaces are located nearby rather than at the opposite end of the road. The spaces are proposed on the western side of the road to afford greater visibility for vehicles exiting Kyngeshene Gardens into Tangier Road. Additionally, by having the bays on the western side, and whilst still allowing two-way flow, priority is given to those vehicles driving up the hill. This combined with the bays further down Tangier Road create a chicane effect which may assist in calming traffic</p>