



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(WAVERLEY)**

**ANNUAL REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING IN  
WAVERLEY: DEFERRED ITEMS FROM  
16 MARCH 2012 COMMITTEE MEETING**

**22 JUNE 2012**

**KEY ISSUE**

To approve arrangements for progressing Traffic Regulation Orders for proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in the Waverley borough.

**SUMMARY**

Officers have completed a review of on-street parking in Waverley, and identified changes in restrictions which would benefit road safety and reduce instances of obstruction and localised congestion. This report contains the locations that were deferred from the Local Committee on 16 March 2012 so that further consultation, assessments and amendments could be made.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The Local Committee (Waverley) is asked to agree:**

- (i) That the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Waverley as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings presented at this committee meeting at **Annex A** are approved.
- (ii) To allocate funding as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.

- (iii) That the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Waverley as shown on the drawings in **Annex A** are advertised and that, if no objections are maintained, the Order is made.
- (iv) That the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager will consider and try to resolve any objections, and that a decision on any remaining unresolved objections will be made by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and the relevant County Councillor.

### **1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The Annual Review of on-street parking in Waverley was initially presented to this committee on 16 September 2011. Following the advertisement stage, all comments and objections to that advert were brought back to committee on 16 March 2012. In the report presented in March, there were several locations where additional consultation and assessments were needed in order to finalise those particular proposals. This has now been carried out and the proposed alterations and decisions have been included in this report for approval.
- 1.2 Some of these locations will require further advertisement because they are more restrictive than when they were first advertised. Those proposals that are not being progressed or are being made less restrictive can be implemented without a readvertisement.

### **2 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

(Relevant drawing numbers in brackets)

#### **FARNHAM CENTRAL**

##### **2.1 Arthur Road (for information only)**

The advertised proposal for Arthur Road included extending existing sections of the single yellow line to improve access for buses and improve sight lines and road safety where it was necessary to do so. As a result of this proposal, there remain only three unrestricted sections of Arthur Road in which residents and visitors can park.

During the advertisement stage, a resident of Arthur Road made comment about one of these unrestricted sections. They said that with cars parked opposite their property's driveway, it was difficult to manoeuvre in and out of their driveway. This issue was investigated further and the following conclusion was made.

Whilst parked cars opposite a driveway are never ideal, bearing in mind the driveway's side of the road is completely protected by single

yellow line, getting in and out of the driveway is still possible. All three unrestricted sections of Arthur Road have driveways opposite them, and the width of road is the same throughout, therefore to restrict one of these sections to assist with driveway access sets a precedent to restrict the other two sections for the same reason. As unrestricted parking in Arthur Road is now very limited, it is highly sought after by residents without off-street parking and by their visitors. Therefore restricting the road completely by introducing single yellow lines in the three unrestricted sections is not deemed to be appropriate for the road as a whole. However, after the advertised amendments are installed on the ground, Arthur Road will be assessed again as part of further parking reviews of Waverley.

In addition, we received a group signed letter from residents of Arthur Road, which also mentioned the issue of driveway access as stated above. In this letter, the issue of a chicane effect caused by parked vehicles in the unrestricted spaces was mentioned as an additional concern, along with a request for a 2-hour time limit to be considered for two of the unrestricted spaces.

Parked cars on residential streets that have an average road width will always cause through traffic to drive around them. In some cases this helps to slow traffic down but where sight lines are a concern it can cause safety issues. During the parking review the most problematic of unrestricted sections in terms of sight lines was addressed with the proposed extension of single yellow line in the vicinity of number 14. In addition to the two bus stop areas in the vicinity of Arthur Close, which will also become restricted, no other parts of Arthur Road were deemed to be hazardous for through traffic.

With regards to a 2-hour restriction, this will be assessed as part of the next Waverley Parking Review, along with Arthur Road as a whole as previously mentioned above.

### 2.2 **Wykeham Road (For information only)**

The advertised proposal for Wykeham Road was an extension of the Farnham Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), which included other nearby roads such as Beaufort Road and Thorold Road. When this proposal was advertised residents of Wykeham Road raised concerns about the lack of on street parking spaces for the road. However, the proposed number of spaces was the maximum that could be provided under highway regulations, and this was explained in full in a letter sent to all Wykeham Road residents in April. As part of this letter, residents were given three options relating to the detail of the scheme in order to allow us to make a decision on how to proceed.

These options, in brief, were to progress the scheme as originally advertised; to progress the scheme with a downgrade of the double yellow line to single yellow; or not to progress with the extension into

Wykeham Road at all. The vast majority of residents replied in favour of the second option (to progress the scheme with a downgrade of double yellow to single yellow). However, residents stated a proviso that the single yellow line would apply for a shorter period than that which the CPZ currently operates at. There were issues with this, which we had to explain to residents in an additional letter, sent out in June. These were as follows.

The purpose of a CPZ is to provide a blanket restriction throughout a large area, with the entry signs stating the controlled times of the zone. This time period is supposed to be the minimum period that restrictions apply within the zone. Whilst it is possible to have a longer period of restriction within a zone (e.g. double yellow lines / no waiting at any time) there should not be any sections of road where a restriction operates at a shorter period to the zone as a whole, because it contradicts the zone entry signs. We therefore had to leave the single yellow line restriction operating as per the zone hours, and this was explained to residents as stated above.

There was an additional proviso stated by residents regarding a proposed 3m extension of double yellow lines outside number 12 to assist with vehicles turning in and out of the off-street parking area next to number 12. Residents stated that they did not believe that this extension was necessary and were concerned about the lack of space for residents' vehicles. They therefore did not want this extension to be progressed.

A further assessment was made and it was concluded that the extension was still required to assist with the turning of vehicles. However, a 1.5m extension was deemed to be adequate instead of the proposed 3m, in order to provide additional space for vehicles without compromising the turning movements of vehicles.

### 2.3 **Middle Church Lane (24023)**

The advertised proposal for Middle Church Lane was to provide a permit bay for two vehicles (10 metres in length) to formally allow parking during the zone operational hours on the widest part of the road.

During the advertisement residents stated that vehicles park on the opposite side of the road to the proposed parking bay (against the church side wall) when the CPZ is not in operation. If this practice were to continue with cars in the formalised parking bay area then the road would be blocked. It was suggested to have the parking bay on the church wall side of the road instead, to prevent this problem from occurring.

After investigating this, it is feasible to have the parking bay transferred directly to the opposite side of the road. Although the wall will obstruct

one side of the vehicle, residents are clearly used to this parking practice already so it should not present any problems that have not already been experienced.

It is therefore proposed to readvertise the amended parking bay layout as shown on plan 24023.

## **GODALMING SOUTH, MILFORD AND WITLEY**

### **2.4 Church Lane, Witley (24062)**

The advertised proposal for Church Lane was to double yellow line the pinch point section of road outside a property called 'The Old Vicarage' to help prevent obstructive parking, particularly from visitors to the nearby church and public house. During the advertisement, residents raised concerns over the necessity of such a restriction, stating that the part of the road where the double yellow lines were proposed is very rarely parked in. Residents also made the point that it is in a conservation area that currently has no other restrictions of this type nearby.

In March a site meeting was held between local residents and representatives of Surrey County Council, Waverley Borough Council and Witley Parish Council to discuss the proposal. The problem of obstructive parking in the vicinity of 'The Old Vicarage' was discussed and a number of alternative solutions to double yellow lines were brought forward.

It was agreed that it would be best not to proceed with the advertised double yellow lines and for the local residents and Parish Council to erect polite notices in the church and public house advising against parking in this area. Residents would also continue to place polite notices on any vehicles seen causing an obstruction. It was stated to residents that the Police can enforce highway obstruction with or without yellow line restrictions in place, and this option is always there should it be needed.

It is therefore proposed not to go ahead with the proposal as shown on plan 24062.

## **GODALMING NORTH**

### **2.5 Summers Road, Farncombe (24095)**

The advertised proposal for Summers Road included double yellow lines on the north side of the road to keep parking on one side of the road only, with sections of double yellow lines on the south side to act as passing places for through traffic. During the advertisement, concerns were raised that this parking restriction layout should continue up to the Broadwater School to prevent displaced vehicles

causing problems in that part of Summers Road. Following a site meeting with the local County Councillor, extending the restrictions further was deemed to be appropriate and the proposed plan has therefore been changed accordingly. It is proposed to readvertise Summers Road with these changes as shown on plan 24095.

#### **2.6 Deanery Road j/w Frith Hill, Farncombe (24084)**

The advertised proposal for Deanery Road was to extend the existing double yellow lines further to improve sight lines and road safety for vehicles approaching and turning from the Frith Hill junction. During the advertisement residents raised concerns that this proposal did not extend far enough. Following a site meeting with the local County Councillor, it was agreed to extend the proposed double yellow lines further over the bridge to both improve sight lines for the junction but also for vehicles approaching the brow of the hill. It is proposed to readvertise Deanery Road with these changes as shown on plan 24084.

#### **2.7 Station Road, Farncombe (24090)**

In the committee report presented in March, it was agreed to revoke the 1-hour limited waiting restriction on the parking bay opposite North Street except for a 25m section closest to Farncombe Street. Following a site meeting with the local County Councillor, it has now been agreed that it would be best to leave a 30m section of the 1-hour restriction to give shoppers an extra vehicle space. It is therefore proposed to advertise this amendment as shown on plan 24090.

#### **2.8 Update on the implementation of the Waverley Parking Review and on-street charging proposals**

With the Haslemere proposals in abeyance, all remaining proposals for Waverley, as approved at local committee on 16 September 2011 and 16 March 2012, will be implemented in stages during summer and autumn 2012. Some of the simpler proposals which just involve road markings will likely be completed in the summer, whereas the more involved schemes such as the on-street charging and controlled parking zone extensions will likely continue into the autumn.

With regards to on-street charging in Farnham Town Centre, members of the parking team met with representatives of a supplier of pay and display machines, members of Guildford Borough Council's enforcement team and also the conservation officer for Waverley Borough Council to discuss the locations of the machines and associated signing. Locations have been agreed and will be implemented according to the timescales given above.

### **3 STEPS TOWARDS IMPLEMENTATION**

3.1 The following locations will require further advertisement before they can be implemented on the ground. This is anticipated to take place during Autumn 2012.

- Middle Church Lane, Farnham
- Summers Road, Farncombe
- Deanery Road j/w Frith Hill, Farncombe
- Station Road, Farncombe

### **4 OBJECTIONS**

4.1 The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager will consider and try to resolve any objections, and a decision on any remaining unresolved objections will be made by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and the relevant County Councillor.

### **5 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The cost of advertising and implementing these amendments is estimated to be £5,000.

### **6 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 There are no specific equalities and diversity implications for this report.

### **7 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There should be fewer instances of obstructive parking as a consequence of the restrictions.

### **8 CONCLUSION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 It is recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as detailed in **Annex A**. They will make a positive impact towards:-

- Road safety
- Access for emergency vehicles
- Access for refuse vehicles
- Easing traffic congestion
- Better regulated parking

### **9 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT**

9.1 Subject to approval of the committee and budgetary provision being made available, the Traffic Regulation Order will be advertised and the restrictions implemented.

**LEAD/CONTACT  
OFFICER:  
TELEPHONE  
NUMBER:**

Jack Roberts, Engineer

0300 200 1003

**E-MAIL:**

Parking@surreycc.gov.uk

**BACKGROUND  
PAPERS:**

On Street Parking Review in Waverley 2011/12:  
Summary of Consultation Response –  
16 March 2012.

Annual Review of On Street Parking in Waverley –  
16 September 2011.