

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

DATE: WEDNESDAY 12 MARCH 2014

LEAD OFFICER: KEVIN MCKEE, PARKING SERVICES MANAGER,
GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCILSUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW – ONSLOW
VILLAGE AND VARIOUS OTHER LOCATIONS ALREADY
WITHIN THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED
PARKING ZONEDIVISION: ALL WITHIN THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED
PARKING ZONE

<p><u>SUMMARY OF ISSUE:</u></p> <p>The report presents the representations received as a result of the formal advertisement of proposals in Onslow Village and a number of other locations already within the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone. This report makes recommendations to implement the proposals with minor amendments.</p>
<p><u>RECOMMENDATIONS:</u></p> <p>The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree:</p> <p>(i) that in respect to the proposals for Onslow Village, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to the parking restrictions set out in Annexe 1, but with minor amendments which lessen the proposed level of control. The minor amendments are detailed in paragraphs 2.20 & 2.21 and shown in Annexe 6</p> <p>(ii) that in respect to the proposals for Guildford Park Road and Pewley Way, and the various other locations for which no representations were received, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to parking restrictions set out in Annexe 7, so that the controls can be implemented</p>
<p><u>REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:</u></p> <p>To assist with safety, access, traffic movements, increase the availability of space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities, and to and make local improvements.</p>

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

Onslow Village

- 1.1 Various concerns have been raised about the impact that uncontrolled and inconsiderate parking has on safety, access and traffic flow, and particularly for emergency service and public service vehicles, in Onslow Village.
- 1.2 As part of the present parking review, we have conducted two previous informal questionnaire surveys with occupiers within the area, in January and October 2012.
- 1.3 Furthermore, in June - July 2013, a further stage of informal consultation took place, which included public exhibitions.
- 1.4 This is a high level of informal consultation. In part, this has been necessary because the feedback from first two stages of informal consultation was mixed, with no clear preferences expressed across the wider area. The views expressed during the subsequent third stage were similarly also mixed (see Annexe 5).

Other proposals

- 1.5 Within the Guildford town centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), various concerns have been raised about the impact that uncontrolled and inconsiderate parking has on safety, access and traffic flow, and particularly for emergency service and public service vehicles, at times when the present controls do not operate. Within the CPZ, concerns have also been raised about the availability of parking for various user-groups, predominantly residents and their visitors. In addition it has also become necessary to change some parking restrictions due to the construction of new vehicle crossovers.
- 1.6 Proposals to address all of the above concerns are set out in Annexe 7.
- 1.7 The proposals for Onslow Village (see Annexe 1) and the Other proposals (see Annexe 7) were formally advertised on 29 November 2013 with comments to be submitted by 23 December 2013. Occupiers within the Onslow Village area were written to directly, to inform them of the proposals in their area (see Annexe 2).
- 1.8 However, the Surrey Advertiser on Friday 13 December published a front page article that erroneously stated that the Local Committee at its meeting held on 11 December 2013 had decided to implement the parking controls in Onslow Village. The article appeared during the consultation period. The Committee had not discussed the matter at all during its meeting of 11 December 2013.
- 1.9 We decided to extend the formal period for comments to be submitted to 10 January 2014, to give those that may have thought they were too late to make a representation a further opportunity to do so. The extended formal period for making comments was reported in the following week's edition of the Surrey Advertiser. However the paper did not explain it had incorrectly

reported that a decision had been made. A number of people made representations referring to the incorrect original article and asked why they were being given more time to comment when they had read in the paper that a decision had already been made.

- 1.10 This report presents the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of the proposals.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 124 representations were received and all but two relate to the proposals to extend the CPZ into Onslow Village (see Annexe 3*).
- 2.2 One of the other representations received relates to the proposal to convert a single yellow line in Guildford Park Road to a double yellow line, opposite the entrance to the railway station. The other representation received relates to the amendment of the parking restriction markings in Pewley Way to accommodate a newly constructed vehicle crossover. No representations were received about the proposals for Artillery Road, Denzil Road, Guildford Park Avenue, Jenner Road, Poltimore Road, Stocton Road and Upper Edgeborough Road (see Annexe 8).

Onslow Village

- 2.3 In addition to the publication of the public notice of intent in the Surrey Advertiser, over 500 properties within the Onslow Village area were notified directly about the proposals in their area. Street notices were also erected throughout the area. The proposals were also available to view and comment upon on Guildford Borough Council's website, and the majority of those that responded did so by email.
- 2.4 In total, 122 representations were received (see Annexe 3*) concerning Onslow Village. 17 of these were received during the extended formal period. The representations originated from 109 households. All but 8 of these are known to have come from properties that were written to directly. This represents a 20% response rate of those written to, which is high for the formal advertisement stage. In cases where a household has written in more than once all the views have been considered but for analysis we have counted the views as one combined representation from the particular households. A summary of the representations appears in Annexe 4.
- 2.5 As is nearly always the case with the formal advertisement process, more of those making representations oppose the proposals (55) than support them (51). However, the large number of representations either fully supportive (31), or generally supportive (20) of the proposals, is high. Furthermore, of those who made representations from within the proposed CPZ (i.e. not including those received from Abbots Close, Farnham Road, High View Road, Manor Way and Powell Close) there was a significant majority in support of the proposals. The breakdown is; those fully supportive (27), and generally supportive (14), compare to opposed (29).

ITEM 10

- 2.6 As with the previous, informal stages of consultation (see Annexe 5), those making representations express mixed views in many locations. Those opposing the proposals do so for a variety of reasons. These include, there being no need for controls and the loss of space.
- 2.7 Both observations, and the previous stages of informal consultation, indicate that there are parking issues in many locations around Onslow Village, but particularly near to junctions, bends and points of access. The proposed number of spaces provided (126, including 74 prioritised for permit-holders) broadly matches the demand for space. In some locations, the number of spaces proposed exceeds current demand, whilst in others, it does not.
- 2.8 More specific reasons for opposing the proposals include the position of some of the parking bays (11), the inclusion of Saturdays (9), the aesthetics of the signs and lines (8) and the provision of some unrestricted parking (8). Conversely, some (7) state a preference for the provision of some unrestricted parking.
- 2.9 The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.
- 2.10 It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.
- 2.11 The position of the proposed zone boundary will actually result in a reduction in the number large zone boundary signs necessary. The signs associated with the parking bays will be kept to a minimum and located sensitively. Furthermore, 50mm primrose markings will be used throughout, rather than the more standard, wider yellow road markings.
- 2.12 The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.
- 2.13 During the previous informal stages of consultation, those in Manor Way and Abbots Close consistently expressed clear opposition to their roads' inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that these roads were on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Committee decided not to include them within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

- 2.14 However, now that the proposals (excluding these roads) have been formally advertised, nearly all the representations from Manor Way (The Crossways to Abbots Close) and half of those from Abbots Close object to the proposals on the basis of their roads' omission. Instead, the representees, and those from others nearby roads express a preference for these roads / section of road to be included within the CPZ – Manor Way (17) and Abbots Close (8).
- 2.15 If the Committee were now to give consideration to including Manor Way (The Crossways to Abbots Close) and Abbots Close within the CPZ, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for these roads to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that these roads remain outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.
- 2.16 Prior to the formal proposals being finalised, one of the major points of discussion was whether to include a number of other roads that had expressed opposition (some repeatedly) to their roads' inclusion within the CPZ during the previous stages of informal consultation. These included Bannisters Road, Litchfield Way and Vicarage Gate. However, were these roads to be omitted from the CPZ, their position would mean that they would be completely surrounded by roads within the CPZ. Previous experience elsewhere within the CPZ has shown that this can cause significant issues. This led the Committee to decide to include them within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.
- 2.17 Representations from Bannisters Road are mixed with around the same number fully supportive (6) and generally supportive (1) of the proposals, as opposed (6). In Litchfield Way, there is a similar pattern to the representations with fully supportive (3) and opposed (2). In Vicarage Gate, representations fully supportive (3), compare with those opposed (1). Although views are mixed, for the reasons outlined in paragraph 2.16, we therefore recommend that these roads are included within the CPZ.
- 2.18 In Wilderness Road, the previous informal consultations showed opinion to be mixed, with some parts of the road clearly supportive of inclusion within the CPZ. The representations received, as a result of the formal advertisement process, display a similar trend with fully supportive (5), generally supportive (6), compared to opposed (14). However, of those opposed, 11 of the 14 are from one particular development within the road, Wilderness Court. Indeed, representations received from those living at Wilderness Court represent over a third of all those received from within the proposed CPZ that oppose the proposals. Those living there raise concerns about the loss of parking space. Some residents say that although there are garages at Wilderness Court, the vast majority of these are not associated with those living there, and many residents are solely reliant on on-street parking.
- 2.19 At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However,

others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.

2.20 In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.

2.21 To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service. We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and the greater availability of space (see Annexe 6).

2.22 During the various previous stages of informal consultation, those in locations such as Ellis Avenue and West Meads, have been almost unanimously supportive of inclusion within the CPZ. However, the representations received as a result of the formal advertisement show a lower level of support. In Ellis Avenue, those fully supportive (5) and generally supportive (1), compare with those opposed (3). The only representation received from West Meads opposes the proposals. Although some of the opposition relates to the positioning of parking bays, much of it is associated with the fact that the proposals will not remove non-resident parking entirely. The Committee previously decided to include an amount of unrestricted parking as part of the formal proposals, to reduce the possibility of further displacement and increase the flexibility of the scheme for residents and their visitors, particularly at less busy times. We therefore recommend that the proposals for Ellis Avenue and West Meads are implemented as advertised.

2.23 The majority of the representations about High View Road relate to the proposals around the 'switchback' junction within the road, rather than those proposed at its junction with Manor Way. One representation suggests that the proposed restrictions around the 'switchback' are not extensive enough, and that they should be extended to outside No.31, with a similar increase in extents on the opposite side of the road. Households adjacent to the proposed double yellow line object on the basis of the loss of the ability to parking. The proposal was developed after the Police contacted Parking Services. They had been called to the location on at least one occasion after buses had become grounded whilst turning. They suggested that, because of the rapidly altering gradient around the junction, buses and other large vehicles had a tendency to ground when vehicles parked in the vicinity and opposite the junction. The proposals developed are the minimum required to overcome these issues, by allowing larger vehicles to use the full

width of the carriageway. The proposed controls around the junction with Manor Way received little comment. That location has an accident history. We therefore recommend that the proposals for High View Road are implemented as advertised.

2.24 In conclusion, we therefore recommend implementing the proposals broadly as advertised, but with a lessening in the level of control within Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, and as detailed in Annexe 6.

Other proposals

2.25 In addition to the publication of the public notice of intent in the Surrey Advertiser, street notices were also erected in each specific locality. The proposals were also available to view and comment upon on Guildford Borough Council's website.

2.26 With regard to the proposal for Guildford Park Road, the representation opposes the proposal on the basis of the loss of the ability to park. Parking of longer durations is currently possible outside the present operational hours of the single yellow line, which are Monday to Saturday 8.30am to 6pm. However, it is parking at these times, and in the vicinity of the nearby pedestrian refuge, taxi rank and bus stop that causes traffic flow issues, for those heading to and from the town centre. Drivers are allowed to stop to allow passengers to board or alight on either double or single yellow lines, so the proposal to introduce a double yellow line will not change this. However, the double yellow line restriction will not be available for parking at any time. Indeed, the removal of parking may increase the availability of space for those wishing to board and alight. We therefore recommend implementing the change as proposed.

2.27 With regard to the proposal for Pewley Way, the representation did not oppose the change, but thought that there was scope to further revise the position of the parking bay, so that its extents are located equidistant from the property boundary of Nos.23 & 25. At present, the proposal merely revises the parking bay's north-western extent, albeit retaining the ability of the bay to accommodate two vehicles. If the parking bay's south-eastern extent was revised, as suggested by the representee, it would bring the bay closer to the parking bay on the opposite side of the road outside No.26 and positions the bay closer to No.25's driveway. To make such a change we would need to re-advertise the proposal to give the people effected the chance to comment. We therefore recommend implementing the change as proposed.

3. OPTIONS:

3.1 The Committee must consider the representations received. It needs to decide whether to implement the proposals as original advertised, or implement the proposals with the recommended changes, or to drop some, or all of the proposals. The proposals have been formally advertised and only minor amendments that lessen the degree of control can be made at this stage. If the Committee wish to make significant changes, or increase the

degree of control, the relevant proposals would need to be re-advertised to give road users the opportunity to comment.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

4.1 The proposals have been formally advertised in the Surrey Advertiser and by using street notices at the particular locations. In the case of Onslow Village, properties in the areas affected have been written to notify them of the proposals and there has been three stages of informal consultation before the proposals were formally advertised.

4.2 The representations, and possible amendments to the proposals have been circulated to relevant borough and county councillors and the proposals for Onslow Village have been discussed with the local ward and divisional councillors.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 To create the order and implement the signs and lines required to give affect to the proposals we estimate will cost no more than £17,500. If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals, the money will come from the Guildford on-street parking account.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 Blue badge holders can park in disabled parking bays without time limit or on yellow lines for up to three hours and are exempt from charges for parking on-street. They can also park for an unlimited period in residents only, shared-use or limited waiting parking places.

6.2 Carers permits are available for the use of either carers or family members who help residents who require regular visits to maintain an independent lifestyle and remain at home.

7. LOCALISM:

7.1 The proposals will affect all road users in the areas where restrictions are proposed and particularly residents. All the proposals have been publicised, many have drawn comments from residents and local communities, and these have been carefully considered.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate	Set out below.

Change and Carbon Emissions)	
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

Sustainability implications

- 8.1 Parking sits alongside Climate Change and Air Quality within the strategies that feed into the Surrey Transport Plan. Therefore, in many respects, these strategies and sustainability are inter-dependant.
- 8.2 Preventing parking in locations where it would otherwise cause safety and access issues, and in particular, impede traffic, helps reduce congestion, the resultant journey times and pollution. This can be particularly important on bus routes where large, public service vehicles utilise relatively narrow roads.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 We have carefully considered the representations received and recommend the Committee implemented the proposals as follows:
- (i) that in respect to the proposals for Onslow Village, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to the parking restrictions set out in Annexe 1, but with minor amendments which lessen the proposed level of control. The minor amendments are detailed in paragraphs 2.20 & 2.21 and shown in Annexe 6.
 - (ii) that in respect to the proposals for Guildford Park Road and Pewley Way, and the various other locations for which no representations were received, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to parking restrictions set out in Annexe 7, so that the controls can be implemented.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to implement the changes we will engage a contractor to carry out the work to erect signs and lay the lines required. A public notice will be placed in the Surrey Advertiser, street notices placed in areas where the changes will be introduced, anyone who has made a representation will be written to and the order will be made.
- 10.2 In the case of Onslow Village, the occupiers within the area would again be written to directly.

ITEM 10

Contact Officer:

Andrew Harkin, On-Street Parking Co-ordinator (01483 444535)

Consulted:

Road users

Residents

Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

- 1 - Formally advertised proposals - Onslow Village,
- 2 - Letter sent to properties in the Onslow Village area,
- 3 - Representations received resulting from the advertisement of the above (* available online and in hard copy on request),
- 4 - Summary of representations,
- 5 - Overview of previous informal consultation responses,
- 6 - Revised proposals recommended for implementation - Onslow Village,
- 7 – Formally advertised proposals - Other proposals,
- 8 - Representations received resulting from their advertisement.

Sources/background papers:

- Item 6, Local Committee (Guildford), 22 September 2011.
 - Item 9, Local Committee (Guildford), 13 June 2012.
 - Item 8, Local Committee (Guildford), 13 March 2013.
 - Item 8, Local Committee (Guildford), 18 September 2013.
-