



OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE GUILDFORD

REVIEW OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN AREAS OUTSIDE THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE – ASHENDEN ESTATE, PARK BARN AND WESTBOROUGH

22 September 2010

KEY ISSUE

This report presents proposals for improving the regulation of parking in the Ashenden Estate, Park Barn and Westborough and asks members to consider feedback from the subsequent informal consultation. It also makes recommendations to formally advertise the introduction of new parking controls.

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 / assessment, and recommends that the proposals for the Ashenden Estate, Park Barn and Westborough be formally advertised.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

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

- (i) The proposals shown in ANNEXE 4 be formally advertised as an intention to make an Order, and if no objections are maintained, the Order be made,

- (ii) a further report is presented to the Committee to consider any unresolved representations that may arise,

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 In September 2009 the Committee agreed for officers to develop and informally consult upon proposals for parking restrictions in the Ashenden Estate, Park Barn and Westborough, as well as Stoughton and Slyfield Industrial Estate.
- 1.4 Officers subsequently met with the Borough and County ward members to outline the proposals, and where necessary, make minor changes, prior to consulting informally.
- 1.5 The informal consultation involved writing to over 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.
- 1.6 In total, 7 exhibitions were held at the Park Barn Centre (3), Emmanuel Church Hall (2) 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.
- 1.7 In the Ashenden Estate, Park Barn and Westborough area 1550 occupiers (predominantly residents) were written to. The 3 exhibitions at the Park Barn Centre attracted 141 visitors. In total, 143 comment forms, emails, letters were received about the proposals in this area, 123 of them coming from those written to directly.

- 1.8 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.

2 ANALYSIS

- 2.1 Southway and roads within the Ashenden Estate do not currently have any parking restrictions, although there are controls nearby in Egerton Road and Aldershot Road. It is alleged that all-day parking by university students, hospital workers and Tesco staff cause safety and access issues in several roads and impacts on the availability of parking for residents and visitors to the shopping parade. The proposals seek to resolve these issues.
- 2.2 A detailed analysis of the feedback regarding this locality is shown in ANNEXE 3.
- 2.3 Across the areas, 125 comment forms were received from those who were written to directly. This equates to 8% of the properties notified. A further 20 comments were received from those from elsewhere. However, there is a marked difference in the response rates from the Ashenden Estate (44 responses - 27% of households) and Southway areas (81 responses - 6% of households).

Ashenden Estate

- 2.4 44 comment forms were received from those who were written to directly, equating to 27% of the properties notified. A further 4 comments were received from those from elsewhere.
- 2.5 43 (98%) of respondents strongly/tended to agree that there were parking issues in their road. 41 (93%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls and 42 (96%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls if adjacent roads were. 32 (76%) strongly/tended to agree that the proposed controls would improve the situation (see ANNEXES 3.1-3.4).
- 2.6 In Ashenden Estate analysis of the other comments raised has identified a number of recurring themes. Some are location specific, whilst others were raised generally across the area.
- 2.7 Although it was recognised that controls were necessary to resolve the present issues, about a quarter of respondents were concerned about the loss of parking associated with the proposed controls and the

increased pressure on the space which would remain. As a result, around a third of respondents wanted more extensive controls, such as residents' parking, to be considered. Some wanted such measures introduced without restrictions to prevent parking around junctions and bends.

- 2.8 Respondent also expressed a desire for the cause of the issues to be dealt with at source (i.e. parking associated with the hospital, university, Tesco and multi-vehicle student households within the estate, even possibly through development control), rather than trying to resolve issues associated with their resultant impact in neighbouring areas.
- 2.9 Concerns were also raised about verge and pavement parking by just under a quarter of respondents, and some were concerned about the tendency for parked vehicles to obstruct driveways. However, it is evident that this activity occurs at all times, and not just when non-residents are more likely to be parking in the road, so if the issue was to be addressed (either by parking controls or physical measures), it could have a significant impact on the availability of space for those living within the estate. Nevertheless, recent legislation allows enforcement to be taken against vehicles parked across lowered kerbs, without the need for formalised controls to be introduced.
- 2.10 A number of respondents also raised the need for traffic calming and indeed the introduction of a one-way, to reduce the conflict caused by two-way flow around the estate. There are pros and cons associated with both, and clearly, these measures are beyond the scope of the present parking review.
- 2.11 The draft proposals were generally welcomed in principle if not in absolute detail. However, the proposed controls at junctions and around sharp bends are consistent with Surrey County Council's guidelines.
- 2.12 Nevertheless, a number of opportunities have been identified to reduce the extent of the proposed restrictions (namely at Beech Grove's junctions with Cherry Tree Avenue and Ashenden Road). Conversely, concerns were raised about the lack of controls around the turning circles within Beech Grove and the limited length of the proposed waiting restrictions in Ashenden Road, between the Tesco roundabout and its junction with Cherry Tree Avenue. Therefore, more extensive controls are now proposed in these locations. The amendments should further assist with access and have been incorporated into the proposals shown in ANNEXE 4.

Southway & Environs

- 2.13 81 comment forms were received from those who were written to directly, equating to 6% of the properties notified. A further 16 comments were received from those from elsewhere.

- 2.14 64 (81%) of respondents strongly/tended to agree that there were parking issues in their road. 58 (83%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls and 61 (78%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls if adjacent roads were. When it came to whether the proposed controls would improve the situation 37 (47%) suggested that they would (see ANNEXES 3.5-3.8).
- 2.15 Across the area analysis of the other comments raised has identified a number of recurring themes. Some are location specific, whilst others were raised generally across the area.
- 2.16 Although it was recognised that controls were necessary to resolve the present issues, almost half of respondents were concerned about the loss of parking associated with the proposed controls, the increased pressure on the parking which would remain, and the potential for displacement into adjacent roads. As such, around a third of respondents wanted residents' parking to be considered.
- 2.17 Those living on the north side of Southway / on the inside of the bend (between Foxburrows Avenue and Fairfield Rise) were particularly concerned by the proposals as parking on their side of the road, opposite the lay-bys on the south side / outside of the bend, would be restricted during the day (Monday-Saturday). However, it is the parking by a relatively small number of vehicles on the north side of the road in this section (usually on the footway) which is the most disruptive to traffic during the day when flows are generally greater. Parking will still be permitted in these locations at other times.
- 2.18 Like the Ashenden Estate, respondents also expressed a desire for the cause of the issues to be dealt with at source (i.e. parking associated with the hospital, university, Tesco and multi-vehicle student households within the estate, even possibly through development control), rather than trying to resolve issues associated with their resultant impact in neighbouring areas.
- 2.19 The need for effective enforcement was raised as an issue as were concerns about verge and pavement parking.
- 2.20 A number of respondents also raised the need for additional traffic calming and changes to the highway layout. Some also expressed a desire for additional parking facilities to be created. Clearly, all of these are beyond the scope of the present parking review.
- 2.21 The draft proposals were generally welcomed in principle if not in absolute detail. Nevertheless, a number of opportunities were identified to amend, and in some cases reduce, the extent of the proposed restrictions.

- 2.22 Although one of the public transport operators was pleased with the proposed controls in Southway, between Egerton Road and Cabell Road, which proposed parking primarily on the south side of the road, concerns were expressed by the school and community association about the loss of facility caused by having the parking that side of the road, rather than immediately outside the schools. Although the presence of School Keep Clear markings and bus stops on the north side of the road reduce the availability of parking for those associated with the school, and retaining parking on the inside of the bend will not lead to improvements in forward visibility for those travelling along the road, the restriction of parking on the opposite side of the road will, nevertheless, remove the 'pinch points' where inconsiderate parking presently can have a significant impact on traffic movement. Therefore, it is proposed to swap the parking over from south to north.
- 2.23 In cul-de-sac locations where traffic flows are relatively low, the no waiting at any time junction protection measures have been amended so that parking isn't restricted opposite junctions. A similar approach has been adopted in some straight and / or wide sections of carriageway where parking opposite junctions is less likely to cause access issues. This will provide more space for parking. Even so, the revised proposals will still ensure improved forward visibility for those turning in and out of the various junctions.
- 2.24 The length of the 2-hour limited waiting parking spaces outside the shops at Nos.107-113 Southway has been extended to provide greater opportunities for customers to park.
- 2.25 Some respondents from areas beyond the extents of the present review wanted controls to be introduced. A number were received from locations in Park Barn, beyond the present proposals. However, their distance from the current proposals means that it would be unlikely for the parking to be affected detrimentally by them. However, respondents living at the southern end of Beckingham Road were concerned that the introduction of restrictions in Southway could lead to the displacement of parking into their road. Therefore, because of their close proximity to the current proposals, a series of measures are now proposed for the turning-circle, bends and various junctions in the vicinity.
- 2.26 Within the review area, it is now also proposed to formalise a number of the Disabled Only Parking Places that have been introduced by the County Council for specific residents. This will enable enforcement officers to deal with any misuse of these bays by non-Blue Badge holders, whilst undertaking their other enforcement duties.
- 2.27 These amendments have been incorporated into the proposals shown in ANNEXE 4.
- 2.28 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.

3 OPTIONS

- 3.1 The proposed emphasis of the review is to consider long-standing issues in a small number geographic locations (Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough, Stoughton and the Slyfield Industrial Estate). Additionally a small number of the other 117 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 117 ad-hoc issues raised, although this would impact on the geographic reviews.
- 3.3 Similarly, whilst there was a desire amongst some for more restrictive controls to be considered in the Ashenden Estate and Southway areas, Members should be aware 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 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.
- 3.4 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, or delay the next review of the Controlled Parking Zone.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Following this meeting it is proposed to formally advertise the proposals shown in ANNEXE 4, and like the informal consultation stage, write to all those in and around the proposed controls.

5 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The cost of undertaking the initial consultation in Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough, Stoughton and Slyfield, 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).
- 5.2 All the above costs can be funded from the CPZ on-street account.

6 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 A number of existing disabled bays are present and requests for additional bays been made as a result of the informal consultation process. It is proposed that the existing and any new disabled bays are formalised to allow them to be enforced. Similarly, Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group has been asked to consider introducing no stopping clearways at the various bus stops in the areas where formalised controls are being proposed.

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 shown in ANNEXE 4.

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
Local Committee (Guildford) – 23 June 2010, Item 15 & Minute 35/10

Version No. 3 Date: 7/9/10 Time: 11:00 Initials: APH No of annexes: 4