



OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE GUILDFORD

REVIEW OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN AREAS OUTSIDE THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE – STOUGHTON CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE & SURROUNDING AREA (INCLUDING GRANGE ROAD & WORPLESDEN ROAD)

22 September 2010

KEY ISSUE

This report presents proposals for improving the regulation of parking in the Stoughton Controlled Parking Zone and surrounding area, Grange Road and Worpleston Road 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 Stoughton Controlled Parking Zone and surrounding area, Grange Road and Worpleston Road 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 late 2008 the County Council consulted on various options to resolve some of the traffic issues in Grange Road, including the introduction of a one-way system, or revisions to the parking controls. The latter, parking restriction-based option was preferred. Concerns have also been received regarding parking in around Worplesdon Road's junctions with Byrefield Road and Sheepfold Road and the Borough Council's Engineers have developed proposals to re-engineer the area; although this will still require formalised parking controls.
- 1.4 In September 2009 the Committee agreed for officers to develop and informally consult upon proposals for parking restrictions within the Stoughton CPZ and the surrounding area, Grange Road and Worplesdon Road, as well as Ashenden Estate, Park Barn and Westborough and Slyfield Industrial Estate.
- 1.5 Officers subsequently met with the Borough and County ward members to outline the proposals, and where necessary, make minor changes, prior to consulting informally.
- 1.6 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.
- 1.7 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.

- 1.8 Within the Stoughton CPZ and the surrounding area, Grange Road, and Worplesdon Road, 1705 occupiers (predominantly residents) were written to. The 2 exhibitions at the Emmanuel Church Hall attracted 193 visitors. In total 194 comment forms, emails and letters were received about the proposals in this area, 170 of them coming from those written to directly.
- 1.9 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 A number of roads within Stoughton are already subject to parking restrictions, and form a small, localised CPZ. The proposals seek opportunities to create additional parking where possible within the existing CPZ and deal with other issues in the vicinity caused by inconsiderate parking. The proposals seek to resolve these issues as well as those previously highlighted in Grange Road and the junctions of Worplesdon Road.
- 2.2 A detailed analysis of the feedback regarding this locality is shown in ANNEXE 3
- 2.3 170 comment forms were received from those who were written to directly. This equates to 10% of the properties notified. The response rates from the existing CPZ (109 responses - 8% of households), Grange Road (60 responses - 7% of households) and Worplesdon Road (12 responses - 4% of households) were fairly similar**. A further 24 comments were received from those from elsewhere.

*** Some of the comments received related to various of the proposals, hence the apparent discrepancy between the overall number of responses received and the sum total of those about the individual areas.*

Grange Road

- 2.4 60 comment forms were received from those who were written to directly, equating to 7% of the properties notified. A further 4 comments were received from those from elsewhere.
- 2.5 39 (65%) of respondents strongly/tended to agree that there were parking issues in their road. In Grange Road itself, this figure stood at 10 (83%). 28 (46%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls and 35 (60%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls if adjacent roads were. 25 (42%) strongly/tended to agree that the proposed controls would improve the situation (see ANNEXES 3.1-3.4).
- 2.6 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 measures 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.
- 2.8 Those living at the southern end of Grange Road were particularly concerned about the loss of parking, as were some in adjacent roads, where controls are being proposed, such as Stoughton Road, Little Street, Badger Close and Heron Close. Because of concerns about the reduction in availability of space, a number of respondents suggested the introduction of a permit scheme. Others suggested the creation of additional parking facilities.
- 2.9 A number of respondents also suggested that the possibility of a one-way system / re-engineering (previously considered as part of the County Council's study) should be revisited. There was also a desire amongst some to see the volume of traffic in Grange Road reduced, rather than restricting parking to help facilitate the present levels of traffic flow. It was also suggested that the issues only tended to occur during the school run associated with Northmead School.
- 2.10 Although there is a wish for something to be done to resolve the present issues in Grange Road, there would appear to be less of a desire for this to be achieved through the use of parking controls, amongst those consulted directly as part of the informal consultation, at least. Nevertheless, this consultation and the previous, wider study conducted by the County Council would suggest a level of support for parking measures. It is also the case that the draft proposals were consistent with Surrey County Council's guidelines.
- 2.11 Even so, a number of opportunities have been identified to amend / reduce the extent of the proposed restrictions, to try to allay some of the

concerns raised about the original proposals, and the reduction in the availability of parking in particular.

- 2.12 One of the principal aims of the controls towards the southern end of Grange Road was to improve the ability for vehicles to pass. The present unbroken lengths of parking often mean that drivers of vehicles approaching from either direction have to commit to proceeding without being able to assess whether the road ahead (often beyond the bend outside Nos.39-53) is clear, and not knowing whether there are opportunities to pull in, once committed.
- 2.13 The original proposal was for a 25-metre long free unrestricted parking bay to be introduced. This would have significantly improved forward visibility for vehicles approaching from either direction and given motorists a greater opportunity to assess whether there was an opportunity to proceed safely, whilst also accommodating some parking. On balance, however, it is now proposed for a 40-metre long length of kerb to remain uncontrolled and available for parking. This is the maximum advisable unbroken length of parking in circumstances where the road width results in single file traffic and the need for passing. Additionally, outside the control hours of the restrictions, the single yellow lines away from junctions and bends will be available to be parked upon, thereby minimising the displacement effect when parking by residents and their visitors are likely to be at its greatest.
- 2.14 The proposals in Grange Road north of the bend outside Nos.39-53 have also been amended. Although an (unsupported) double yellow line is current in-situ outside Nos.59-63, and the draft proposals suggested a single yellow line should be introduced in this location, the amended proposals will leave a section of kerb in this area uncontrolled, and available for parking. Furthermore, the no waiting at any time restriction outside the former Stoughton Grange School will be removed, and replaced with a single yellow line, which will extend to opposite the entrance to Northmead School.
- 2.15 In a number of the cul-de-sacs off Grange Road and Stoughton Road, where traffic flows are relatively low, some of the no waiting at any time junction protection measures have been amended so that parking isn't restricted opposite junctions. In the case of Little Street, the proposed measures protecting the access to Nos.9-12 have also been shortened so that they only extend around the bellmouth raised table at the junction. These changes will retain more space for parking. Nevertheless, it is now proposed to introduce an at any time waiting restrictions on the inside of the 90-degree bend outside and adjacent to No.20. The revised proposals will ensure improved forward visibility for those turning in and out of the various junctions and approaching bends.
- 2.16 These amendments have been incorporated into the proposals shown in ANNEXE 4.

2.17 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.

Stoughton CPZ

- 2.18 109 comment forms were received from those who were written to directly, equating to 7% of the properties notified. A further 20 comments were received from those from elsewhere.
- 2.19 81 (75%) of respondents strongly/tended to agree that there were parking issues in their road. 64 (60%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls and 75 (70%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls if adjacent roads were. 42 (41%) strongly/ tended to agree that the proposed controls would improve the situation (see ANNEXES 3.5-3.8).
- 2.20 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.
- 2.21 Around a quarter of those responding were concerned about the general lack of space and potential for further losses. Somewhat surprisingly, several responses of this nature came from locations where the intention of the proposals is actually to create space / reduce restrictions. The need to create significant amounts of additional space in locations such as Manor Road and New Cross Road was also raised.
- 2.22 There was also a desire amongst some for residents' parking to be introduced, primarily from locations such as Parkhurst Road and Deerbarn Road, where non-resident visitors to establishments such as the doctors' surgery, exert pressure.
- 2.23 Around a fifth of respondents raised the need for effective enforcement.
- 2.24 Pavement parking was also raised as an issue by a number of respondents. Multiple comments were received about that which takes place in Aldershot Road and Ardmore Avenue. Other forms of obstructive parking, such as parking across driveways, was raised by a number of respondents.
- 2.25 The increasing number of multi-occupancy houses was also raised as a concern, because of the increased pressure this places on the available kerb space.

- 2.26 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. Conversely, concerns raised by a number of respondents living in 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, both within Beckingham Road, Grantley Road and Weston Road.
- 2.27 In Ardmore Avenue, there have previously been concerns about access, particularly for larger vehicles, and also pavement parking. Therefore, the draft proposals were developed to protect bends and junctions within the road. Enforcement against pavement parking would also be possible where these additional controls were present. However, the need for extensive controls around the bends in particular has been reviewed, and amended, so that now the proposals will only restrict parking on the inside of the bends. This will retain more parking whilst also improving access.
- 2.28 In New Cross Road, there was an intention to introduce a new parking bay on the south side of the road, near to the junction with Worplesdon Road. It has become evident, however, that the garage / car wash opposite maybe redeveloped and there is the potential for a greater number of turning manoeuvres in and out of the site, particularly by larger vehicles. Therefore, the proposed bay has been removed from the proposals, to avoid any future potential conflict, and the existing no waiting at any time restriction will be retained. Nevertheless, an opportunity to reduce the length of the junction protection measures in South Road at its junction with New Cross Road has been identified and the proposals amended accordingly. This will increase the availability of space.
- 2.29 In Belvedere Close a couple of lengths of at any time waiting restrictions away from junctions and points of access are now proposed to be converted to Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm restrictions. This will increase the availability of space at times when these restrictions don't apply, which is generally when the pressure on parking from residents is at its greatest.
- 2.30 During the informal consultation a number of respondents highlighted the issues in Fentum Road at its junction with Northway and Shepherds Hill. Although the issues in this area primarily occur at weekends and are associated with the use of Stoughton Rec., the location's proximity to the existing restrictions and the other proposals make it a suitable candidate for the introduction controls. Therefore, at any time waiting restrictions are therefore proposed at these junctions.

- 2.31 Concerns have also been raised about the 2-hour limited waiting parking bay in Woodbridge Hill outside the Co-operative store. Although this bay has a build out at its eastern extent, it is suggested that vehicles which park overhanging the bay markings can cause issues for larger vehicles, such as buses, proceeding along the road whilst negotiating this build out and the nearby pedestrian refuge. It is also evident that the western extent of this parking bay extends across the vehicular access to the rear of the Co-operative store. The parking bay is almost 12 metres long, and as such accommodates two vehicles. To resolve the above issues, however, it is proposed to reduce the bay to 10 metres in length, by curtailing both its eastern and western extents. Despite this, the bay will continue to be able to accommodate two vehicles.
- 2.32 These amendments have been incorporated into the proposals shown in ANNEXE 4.
- 2.33 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.

Worplesdon Road Shops

- 2.34 12 comment forms were received from those who were written to directly, equating to 7% of the properties notified. One other comment was received from elsewhere.
- 2.35 7 (59%) of respondents strongly/tended to agree that there were parking issues in their road. 6 (50%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls and 7 (59%) strongly/tended to agree that their road should be subject to controls if adjacent roads were. 7 (59%) strongly/ tended to agree that the proposed controls would improve the situation. It was evident, however, that the business properties in Worplesdon Road were less welcoming of the proposals. (see ANNEXES 3.9-3.12)
- 2.36 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.
- 2.37 Although most respondents were aware of the issues at the junctions, nearly half of respondents were concerned about the loss of space and the potential for displacement into adjacent areas. A quarter suggested that additional parking facilities should be created.

- 2.38 The parking proposals have been developed to accompany a previously agreed improvement scheme in this section of Worplesdon Road, work on which has recently begun. The length of the lay-by is restricted by the extents of the public highway, statutory undertakers' apparatus and the desire to retain the bus stop on Worplesdon Road. The 2-hour limited waiting within the lay-by will encourage the turnover of space, whilst the at any time waiting restrictions will assist in keeping the junctions and main carriageway clear of parking.
- 2.39 The proposals are shown in ANNEXE 4.
- 2.40 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 Grange Road and certain parts of the Stoughton CPZ area, 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 Stoughton, Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough 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 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 requests for disabled bays been made as a result of the informal consultation process. It is proposed that 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) – 11 March 2009, Item 7 & Minute 07/09
 Local Committee (Guildford) - 30 September 2009, Item 10 & Minute 45/09

Version No. 2 Date: 7-9-10 Time: 03:00 Initials: APH No of annexes: 4