



**VERGE PARKING  
SHEERWATER AND MAYBURY  
ESTATES**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR WOKING  
19 JANUARY 2005**

**KEY ISSUE:**

To determine whether action should be taken to provide parking bays for vehicles which currently park on and damage grass verges in Sheerwater and Maybury Estates.

**SUMMARY:**

Woking Councillors Evans and Khan requested action was taken to provide parking bays in Sheerwater and Maybury Estates and prevent damage to the grass verges.

Officers have found that this practice is so extensive that it goes beyond the intention of the Committee Policy on Verge Parking.

The Committee is asked to decide whether a full survey is conducted of problems and their possible solutions in both Sheerwater and Maybury forming a work programme over many years, whether the Verge Parking Policy should be applied in isolation at particular locations when

finance is available, or whether no action should be taken.

**CONSULTATIONS:**

No consultations have taken place at this stage whilst the Committee indicates future Officer action. They might cause false expectation for residents.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Committee is asked to decide**

- (i) whether a full survey of the problems and possible solutions for verge parking in both Sheerwater and Maybury estates should be conducted, forming a work programme to be tackled in future years when finance is available OR**
- (ii) whether the verge parking policy should be applied in isolation at particular locations when finance is available OR**
- (iii) whether no action should be taken in response to the Councillor's request**

## **INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND**

1. At the Committee meeting of 14 July 2004 questions were asked by Woking Borough Councillors Elizabeth Evans and Riasat Khan regarding the poor condition of grass verges due to vehicle parking in the Maybury Estate and Albert Drive.
2. The Local Transportation Director referred the Committee to the Verge Parking Policy adopted at its meeting of 13 November 2002. (See Annex A attached). Officers were instructed to investigate the existing situation and report back to Committee.

## **ANALYSIS AND COMMENTARY**

3. Residents wish to use their vehicles for work and leisure and the number of vehicles continues to increase. The road system within the estates was not constructed with this volume of vehicles envisaged. Whilst the situation occurs in many areas throughout the Borough both Maybury and Sheerwater Estates have particular problems. They are also self-contained and identifiable areas in themselves where real change can be made and quantified.
4. On initial investigation Officers found that the extent of the problem was such that it may be outside the intended scope of the Verge Parking Policy. Option 3 refers to "Regular damage – no alternative parking .....consideration should be given to the construction of parking bays within the verge." This would deal with small areas in isolation not an entire estate.
5. Whilst it would clearly be possible to provide parking bays in many locations on both Estates the sheer volume of sites needing treatment will make this a costly exercise and no provision has currently been made for this expenditure.
6. Photographs, which will be on display at the meeting, give an indication of the current problem. They by no means deal with all the sites which have verge parking and look unsightly.
7. Whilst sites can be dealt with in isolation the extent of the problem suggests that a more general approach should be adopted – an overall plan for an entire estate. This would be time consuming and costly in itself. County policy seeks modal shift and to make parking provision on a large scale encourages motor vehicle usage. Extension of the public transport provision including the Quality Bus Partnership will provide a viable alternative to the use of motor vehicles. At present it will be difficult to persuade vehicle users to use public transport if they do not have confidence in its ability to provide services they require. There is also an issue with amenity grass being removed and laid to tarmac. As a solution over large areas the appearance may not be acceptable. The outcome will be the creation of car parks in our estates especially where an inadequate road width does not allow vehicle parking and free movement of vehicles, the actual problem in

many of these estate roads which results in verge parking.

8. Maybury Estate has recently had 28 parking bays installed at various locations paid for by Woking Borough Council. The large greens in the Estate including Princess Road, Queen Marys Close, Basset Road, Windsor Way and Balmoral Drive are in the control of Woking Borough Council. Whilst they would provide space to create parking areas this is at the expense of lost amenity.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

9. Currently no allocation has been made from the Local Transport Plan. As Woking Borough Council has paid for parking bays in the past Woking members may wish to consider further provision, including on their controlled areas outlined in paragraph 8 above, to be installed in consultation with the Local Transportation Service.

## **10. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS**

11. Providing improved Public Transport links will encourage fewer journeys by private car.

## **CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

12. Parking on grass verges is in part contrary to a Surrey County Council by-law.

## **EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

13. There are no Equalities Implications.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

14. Officers have found that the extent of the verge parking problem in the Maybury and Sheerwater Estates goes beyond the scope of the Verge Parking Policy. Tackling all the areas within each estate would be time consuming and costly.
15. Members are offered three options for decision and requested to direct officers as to future actions.

**Report by: Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, Woking**

---

**LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER: David Durrant**

**TELEPHONE NUMBER: 01483 518309**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS: Nil**

---

## Annex A

The Committee adopted a verge parking **Policy** at its meeting on 13 November 2002:

“To preserve the grass verges as a notable environmental asset within the Borough and to restore those verges which have been extensively damaged.”

The Committee also adopted a **Strategy** at that same meeting:

- 1) Minor isolated verge damage. Where minor damage has been caused in the past, but regular parking is not occurring, the verge should be repaired in order to restore the pleasant visual aspect of the verge.
- 2) Regular damage – alternative parking available. Where damage is occurring due to regular parking, and officers are satisfied that such parking could safely take place elsewhere, then the verge should be repaired and measures taken to physically protect the verge from further damage by one or more of the measures described above, as appropriate. Where such parking is being practised by residents, they would be informed before any physical protection markings are introduced.
- 3) Regular damage – no alternative parking. Where damage is occurring due to regular parking, but there is nowhere else for such parking to take place safely, consideration should be given to the construction of parking bays within the verge. Such schemes are often perceived by residents as improving substantially their quality of life.

The relevant part of the Strategy, related to this question, is 3 above.

It would therefore be appropriate for the Local Committee to instruct officers to investigate the existing situation, consult with residents, develop options and report back to a future meeting of the Committee.