



OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE GUILDFORD

REVIEW OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN AREAS OUTSIDE THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

23 June 2010

KEY ISSUE

This report updates members on the progress made across the wider review areas and presents proposals for improving the regulation of parking on the Slyfield Industrial Estate and surrounding area and asks members to consider feedback from the subsequent informal consultation.

SUMMARY

As part of the cyclical review of parking issues, it is the turn of issues outside the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone to be considered. This report presents the feedback from the informal consultation, and recommends that the proposals for the Slyfield Industrial Estate and surrounding area be formally advertised.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree that:

- (i) the Guildford Non-Town Centre CPZ and Guildford Parish Consolidation Orders 2004 and subsequent amendment orders are consolidated into two new consolidation orders covering those areas.

- (ii) the proposals shown in ANNEXE 4 be formally advertised as an intention to make an Order under sections 1,2,3,32,35 and 36 and Parts III and IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and if no objections are maintained, the Order be made,
- (iii) a further report is presented to the Committee to consider any unresolved representations that may arise,
- (iv) that Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group considers the introduction of bus stop clearway restrictions at bus stops in the immediate vicinity of the proposals,
- (v) the resources necessary to effectively enforce the proposed restrictions in both this and the other review areas are considered further,
- (vi) reports dealing with the other areas being considered (Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough and Stoughton), and the ad-hoc changes, be reported to the next meeting of this Committee in September.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In December 2004 the Committee agreed a cycle of reviews alternating between the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ) and the areas outside the CPZ. It was envisaged that each cycle would take 18 months with implementation of the changes from one review being implemented during the last six months and coinciding as the design phase for the next review (see ANNEXE 1).
- 1.2 The last review concerning issues outside the CPZ reviewed the situation in Ash, Ash Vale and Ripley. The last review dealing with issues within the CPZ has recently been completed and changes implemented.
- 1.3 Since the original consolidation orders were made in June 2004, a number of amendments orders have been made to the Guildford Town Non-CPZ and Parished Areas orders. Therefore, to bring these orders into line with the Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone consolidation order 2009, ideally the Guildford Town Non-CPZ and Parished Areas orders and amendments should also be consolidated.
- 1.4 A number of years ago the roads within the Industrial Estate were re-engineered and lay-bys created to facilitate parking. However, the existing parking restrictions were not amended to reflect these changes. Additionally, inconsiderate parking takes place where it causes issues to other road uses, both within the Industrial Estate and in the neighbouring residential area.

- 1.5 In September 2009 the Committee agreed for officers to develop and informally consult upon proposals for parking restrictions on the Slyfield Industrial Estate and the surrounding area, as well as the Ashenden Estate, Park Barn and Westborough and Stoughton.
- 1.6 Officers subsequently met with the Borough Council's Industrial Estate Manager and Borough and County ward members to outline the proposals, and where necessary, make minor changes, prior to consulting informally.
- 1.7 The informal consultation involved writing to 3,600 occupiers (predominantly residents) in the vicinity of the proposed restrictions in early May 2010 making them aware of the review process and inviting them to visit several exhibitions. Additionally, over 500 street notices were erected making others aware of the consultation.
- 1.8 In total, 7 exhibitions were held at the Emmanuel Church Hall (2), Park Barn Centre (3) and Stoke & District Agricultural Hall (2). 369 people attended these exhibitions. Those that visited the exhibitions had an opportunity to complete a comment form (ANNEXE 2). Additionally, a dedicated area was created on the Borough Council's website so that those with internet access could view the draft proposals online and complete an online version of the comment form. The closing date for comments was 4 June 2010. In total, 369 comment forms, emails and letters were received, although not necessarily from the same people who attended the exhibitions.
- 1.9 In the case of the Slyfield Industrial Estate and surrounding area around 350 occupiers were written to. The two exhibitions, which were held at the Stoke & District Agricultural Hall, attracted 35 visitors. 21 comment forms, emails and letters were received about the proposals in this area.
- 1.10 Although the Committee agreed at its September 2009 meeting that if there were only to be minor amendments as a result of the informal consultations, that they were discussed and finalised with the Local Members before being advertised, the breadth of issues raised as a result of the consultations is such that it was felt necessary for the Committee to consider the feedback nonetheless. Since the end of the informal consultation period and this Committee meeting, officers have met with Local Members in a number of the review areas to discuss the findings of the informal consultations.
- 1.11 The draft proposals, if introduced, encompass a significant length of additional restrictions. This adds to the existing 165 kilometres of restrictions throughout the Borough. Some, including current and past members of this Committee, have raised concerns about enforcement, suggesting that the levels are not sufficient for the restrictions in some locations to be enforced effectively. The inclusion of additional lengths of restrictions is likely to dilute the level of enforcement overall, and possibly exacerbate these concerns. Furthermore, if even more

restrictive controls than those being proposed, such as extensive limited waiting and residents' priority measures were to be considered, an even greater need for enforcement would result, and levels of enforcement similar to those within the Town Centre CPZ might be required.

- 1.12 Nevertheless, the Committee should be aware that the County Council is in the process of reviewing how it provides parking enforcement services throughout the county.

2 ANALYSIS

- 2.1 The regulating of parking and amendment of the existing restrictions on the Slyfield Industrial Estate is necessary to resolve some of the highway safety and traffic flow issues that are evident and ensure that the controls reflect the revised highway infrastructure, thereby allowing for more effective enforcement. The draft measures in the residential roads immediately beyond the industrial estate have been developed to resolve some of the issues that are already present and pre-empt any that may arise as a result of the possible displacement of parking from the industrial estate.
- 2.2 A summary of the feedback about this locality is shown in ANNEXE 3.
- 2.3 21 comment forms, emails and letters were received, all of which were sent by those who were written to directly. This equates to 6% of the properties notified. 16 of these were comment forms. In subsequent discussions, Local Members were keen for the views of those who sent emails and letters to be considered in a similar manner to those who submitted comment forms. Therefore, a degree of interpretation of their written comments has been undertaken, so that they can be considered on the same basis as the comment forms.
- 2.4 12 (57%) of the responses were from residents living in Woodlands Road, with other responses coming from residents of Slyfield Court (2 - %), Woking Road (2 - %),
- 2.5 14 (67%) strongly/tended to agree that there were parking problems in their road. 10 (48%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls, 11 (52%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls if adjacent roads were. When it came to whether the controls would be effective 11 (52%) strongly/tended to agree that they would be.
- 2.6 Of the responses, only one was received from a property on the industrial estate. The respondent tended to agree that there were parking problems in their road (Moorfield Road) and that their road should be subject to controls. However, they were uncertain whether the controls would be effective, neither agreeing nor disagreeing. Representatives from another business on the industrial estate attended

the exhibition. Although they did not subsequently submit written comments, they expressed general support for the proposals.

- 2.7 Analysis of the other comments raised has identified a number of recurring themes. Some are location specific, whilst others are about general issues throughout the area.
- 2.8 Although it was generally recognised that changes were required to the parking controls on the industrial estate, to deal with safety and access issues there, concerns were raised by residents about the possibility of displacement from the industrial estate into the neighbouring residential area. Generally, there was a desire for more spaces to be created on the industrial estate to minimise this. Clearly the latter is beyond the scope of the present on-street parking, although the proposals have endeavoured to limit the loss of parking on the estate, whilst ensuring that the safety and access objectives of the review are met. Only one respondent suggested residents' parking priority measures were necessary in the neighbouring residential area.
- 2.9 Concerns about verge and pavement parking were also raised by a number of respondents, principally relating to Woodlands Road, whilst others wanted engineering solutions to facilitate additional parking in these areas. The speed of traffic on Woodlands and Old Farm Roads were also raised as concerns. Improved public transport for the industrial estate was also highlighted, although doubts were cast on its attractiveness to visitors to the industrial estate. The future demand for parking associated with the redevelopment of the former Parrot public house was also raised verbally at the exhibitions. Again, these issues are beyond the scope of the present on-street parking review.
- 2.10 The draft proposals were generally welcomed in principle if not in absolute detail. This was particularly the case with the 90-degree bend where Woodlands Road and Old Farm Road meet (see ANNEXE 4). Parking in the vicinity of this junction causes issues for buses turning. Even so, a couple of people that attended the exhibitions, but who did not subsequently submit written comments, felt that there weren't issues in this area and that the proposals were too restrictive. However, the proposed controls at this junction are in keeping with restrictions to assist the movement of buses in such circumstances.
- 2.11 Nevertheless, a couple of opportunities were identified to reduce the extent of the proposed restrictions (namely a disused access to the Abbatoir on Woodlands Road and an area opposite a junction in Slyfield Green, outside Slyfield Court). On the industrial estate itself there have been a few minor changes, primarily in cases where the Ordnance Survey plan varied from the actual situation on the ground. A couple of areas in Westfield Road, where 'in carriageway' parking would have been permitted simultaneously on both sides of the road have also been amended, so that parking is only permitted on one side (outside No.8, Nos.10-12 & Nos.21-23). This should assist with traffic flow and reduce

the possibility of conflict with turning manoeuvres associated with the units in the vicinity. These have been incorporated into the proposals shown in ANNEXE 4.

- 2.12 Whilst the intention is that the proposals will assist with the movement of buses, clearly the control of parking elsewhere may lead to displacement. In some cases, there is the potential for bus stops to be parked within. Therefore, it would be advisable for the County Council's Passenger Transport group to consider introducing bus stop clearway designation orders and markings/signs at all bus stops within the immediate vicinity of our proposals. This would then enable enforcement officers to deal with any infringements of these restrictions, whilst undertaking their other enforcement duties.
- 2.13 In relation to the consolidation of the Guildford Non-Town Centre CPZ and Guildford Parish Consolidation Orders 2004 and subsequent amendment orders, this process is a procedural / technical matter that has no effect on the actual controls on the ground, or indeed the way that they are enforced, and is therefore unlikely to throw up any unforeseen issues which could affect the rest of the current review.

3 OPTIONS

- 3.1 The emphasis of the current review is to consider long-standing issues in a small number geographic locations (Slyfield Industrial Estate, Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough, Stoughton). Additionally a small number of the other 130-or-so locations, where concerns have been raised, are also to be addressed.
- 3.2 Of course, if Members were so inclined, they could choose to consider a far greater number of the 130-or-so issues raised, although this would impact on the geographic reviews.
- 3.3 Although there was little desire for more restrictive controls to be considered in the Slyfield area, there were is some calls for such measures in the other areas being considered, the informal consultation associated with which, will be reported to the September meeting of this Committee.
- 3.4 Members should be aware, however, that the officers' ability to deal with the three geographic reviews and the ad-hoc concerns during a single review cycle has principally been due to the limited nature of the controls being considered in these areas (i.e. safety, access and traffic flow measures). The consideration of residents' priority measures, like those within the Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone, is a far more involved process, and would require significant additional design work, and indeed, further stages of consultation, both informal and formal. It should also be noted that Local Members are generally in favour of the the principal of introducing limited controls in the first

instance, an assessment of their effectiveness / impact, and then, if necessary, the consideration of more extensive controls during a future review.

- 3.5 However, if Members were to request the investigation into the possibility of residents' parking proposals in one or more of the geographic areas during the present review, they would have to consider whether they would want to abandon one or more of the proposals for the geographic areas and also possibly the assessment of the ad-hoc requests.
- 3.6 The alternative would be to agree to deviate significantly from the previously agreed parking review cycle timetable, and delay consideration of issues associated with the next CPZ review (for example; the possible extension of the CPZ further into Onslow Village and the operational hours of the CPZ), until such time that the present review was nearing completion.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Following this meeting it is proposed to liaise further with the Local Members and Borough Council's Industrial Estate Manager regarding the proposals for Slyfield before formally advertising them. Discussions with Local Members regarding the proposals for Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough and Stoughton are ongoing and reports will be presented to the September meeting of this Committee.

5 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The cost of undertaking the initial consultation in Slyfield, Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough and Stoughton, the initial and subsequent assessments of the ad-hoc requests, and the cost of formally advertising and implementing any subsequently developed controls is obviously dependent on the scale of the measures involved. Nevertheless, it is not envisaged that this will cost more than £50,000 (combined cost for all the geographic review areas and the ad-hoc changes). Additionally, the £10,000 that was saved by not acquiring the services of a consultant can be put towards this.
- 5.2 All the above costs can be funded from the CPZ on-street account.

6 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no equality or diversity implications.

7 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

8 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 That the amended proposals shown in ANNEXE 4 be formally advertised, and should this consultation result in representations that we are unable to resolve, that these are reported back to a future meeting of the committee for further consideration.

9 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 The proposed controls will ensure easier traffic flow, particularly around junctions and promote a better balance in the use of kerbside space.

10 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

10.1 Advertise the proposals for Slyfield shown in ANNEXE 4.

10.2 Bring reports dealing with the consideration of proposals and informal consultation for the Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough and Stoughton, and the assessment of ad-hoc requests for restrictions, to the September meeting of this Committee.

LEAD OFFICER:	Kevin McKee, Parking Services Manager
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	01483 444530
E-MAIL:	Kevin.mckee@guildford.gov.uk
CONTACT OFFICER:	Andrew Harkin, On Street Parking Co-ordinator
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	01483 444535
E-MAIL:	Andrew.harkin@guildford.gov.uk
BACKGROUND PAPERS:	Local Committee (Guildford) - 30 September 2009, Item 10 & Minute 45/09

Version No.2 Date:11-06-10 Time: 10:45 Initials: APH No of annexes: 4