

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)



SURREY

DATE: WEDNESDAY 24 SEPTEMBER 2014

LEAD OFFICER: KEVIN MCKEE, PARKING SERVICES MANAGER, GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

**SUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW –
CONSIDERATION OF AD-HOC REQUESTS FOR CONTROLS IN
THE AREA OUTSIDE THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE
CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE**

DIVISION(S): ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

The report presents the preliminary assessment of ad-hoc requests for parking controls that have been raised about locations outside the Guildford town controlled parking zone. The intention is to decide which locations should form part of the parking review of areas outside the town centre controlled parking zone. The Committee has already agreed that the review should look at seven geographic areas, which are Merrow Parade, Kingspost Parade, Avondale Estate, Effingham Junction, Fairlands Estate, Shalford and Woodbridge Hill. The report recommends that a number of the ad hoc requests be progressed and parking controls proposed.

The report also details additional changes requested by the developer of the Farnham Road Hospital site, within the Guildford town centre Controlled Parking Zone, to accommodate various amendments to the access arrangements of the site, in addition to those the Committee has already agreed to be advertised as part of the most recent CPZ review.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree:

- (i) that parking controls be proposed for the ad-hoc locations highlighted in ANNEXE 1 and paragraph 2.9, that these are discussed with the affected ward and divisional councillors, and reported to a future meeting of the Committee to acquire authority for them to be formally advertised.
- (ii) to formally advertise the revised proposals shown in ANNEXE 2 to accommodate the changes to the access arrangements associated with the Farnham Road Hospital development, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

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.

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 elsewhere within the borough (non-CPZ). The aim was to complete each cycle in 18 months. In reality, these reviews have generally spanned 24-30 months primarily because of the volume of work in each review, the level of consultation, and the fact that one review is started while the earlier one is still being implemented. In the last twelve years, six reviews have been completed.
- 1.2 We have been considering ways to streamline the review process, without significantly reducing their scope or the level of engagement.
- 1.3 At its December 2013 meeting, the Committee agreed seven geographic areas to be assessed for parking controls as part of the non-CPZ review. The meeting also agreed that a report should be presented assessing the requests for ad-hoc restrictions, those covering concerning one or two roads, or specific locations within particular roads. This assessment has been carried out using the assessment criteria developed and agreed during the last non-CPZ review.
- 1.4 In January 2014, we circulated the list of ad hoc requests to the police, parish councils, and borough and county councillors to ensure it contained all areas of concern.
- 1.5 There is also a need to change the restrictions around the Farnham Road Hospital. At its September 2013 meeting, the Committee agreed various changes to the parking controls within the roads surrounding the hospital site, to accommodate the changes in the access arrangements and, where possible, provide additional parking to compensate for the loss of spaces in various locations. Since that meeting, the developer has made various additional changes to the access arrangement, which require further amendments to the proposed controls. We are now seeking agreement from the committee to advertise the amended proposals with the intention of making an order.
- 1.6 There is often a need to consider changes to parking restrictions to accommodate disabled bays and new vehicle crossovers. Towards the end of the review, we will seek authority from the Committee to advertise the necessary changes with a view to making an order. This will be done as late as possible, so we can accommodate requests received during the course of the review.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 During the last non-CPZ review, a preliminary assessment was undertaken of over 100 locations where ad-hoc requests for controls had made. Controls were subsequently implemented in and around 20 locations. The review also considered three large geographic areas, Stoughton, Westborough and Slyfield.
- 2.2 The current non-CPZ review will be considering issues in seven main geographic areas, Merrow Parade, Kingspost Parade, Avondale Estate, Effingham Junction, Fairlands Estate, Shalford and Woodbridge Hill. Each one is potentially smaller in scale than the three considered during the last non-CPZ review. Additionally, since the last non-CPZ review, the number of requests received for ad-hoc restrictions has increased significantly, to a point where there are now over 250 locations on the list (see ANNEXE 1).
- 2.3 As part of the present review, we have reassessed all the ad-hoc locations that were not progressed previously as part of the last non-CPZ review, to take into account any changes in circumstances. Additionally, we have assessed the considerable number of new requests that we have subsequently received.
- 2.4 The preliminary scoring system was agreed during the last review and considers the classification of the road, whether it is on a bus route, within a conservation area, close to public amenities, near existing controls and has an accident history involving personal injury. These considerations account for around two-thirds of the potential maximum score of 60. There is also an engagement element, which reflects the level of concern about an issue. The score is added to if the issue is raised by any of the following groups; the police, other emergency services, members of parliament, residents' associations, schools, business groups and individual members of the public and councillors from parishes, the borough council or the county council. This accounts for the remaining part of the score.
- 2.5 The Transportation Task Group is presently looking at introducing a priority system for assessing safety and other schemes and will review the criteria for prioritising parking restrictions in the future to ensure all similar assessments consider issues consistently.
- 2.6 Although the number of ad-hoc requests for controls has more than doubled since the last non-CPZ review, there remains the need for only a manageable number of these issues to be progressed.
- 2.7 It is recommended that those locations that score 25 or more are progressed and proposals for parking restrictions developed in consultation with local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.8 Adopting a score of 25 would result in 18 locations being progressed.
- 2.9 During August 2014, we circulated the list of locations and scores to ward and divisional councillors. Councillors highlighted a small number of locations that did not score 25, or above, as meriting progression. These are:
 - College Road, Ash Vale
 - Prospect Road / Elleray Court / Gorseland Close, Ash Vale
 - Aldershot Road (service road serving shopping parade), Westborough

ITEM 13

- Oak Hill, Wood Street Village, Worplesdon
- 2.10 In view of their small number, it is recommended that, in consultation with the relevant ward and divisional councillors, proposals are developed in the locations listed in paragraph 2.9.
- 2.11 Therefore, in total, it is recommended that proposals be developed in the 22 ad-hoc locations (including the 18 highlighted in ANNEXE 1 and the four listed in paragraph 2.9). This is similar to the number of locations where controls were introduced as part of the last non-CPZ review.
- 2.12 A number of the locations recommended for progression involve roads around schools. The objective of any controls developed will be to assist in resolving congestion and parking issues associated with the school run.
- 2.13 County council officers are looking at issues around schools in the Boxgrove area. The issues around St Peter's and St Thomas of Canterbury schools each achieved the highest score in the assessment. The issues around Boxgrove school have a slightly lower score but we recommend considering the impact on this school when looking at St Peter's and St Thomas of Canterbury, and if appropriate, recommend parking controls that complement measures being considered to encourage more walking and cycling to schools in the area.
- 2.14 There are also yellow lines marked on Epsom Road, which are intended to deter parking around an emergency route to, and from the Boxgrove Gardens development, and we propose to make these formal restrictions as part of the review.
- 2.15 To accommodate further revisions to the access arrangements associated with the Farnham Road Hospital redevelopment, it has been necessary to propose further modifications to the existing parking controls. The amendments shown in ANNEXE 2 will achieve this.
- 2.16 Within Area B, the changes in the roads surrounding the hospital will result in the loss of around five spaces in Ludlow Road (four permit B only spaces and a limited waiting shared-use or permit B space). However, it is proposed that an additional permit B only space is provided in Ludlow Road, with a further five permit B only spaces and a limited waiting shared-use or permit B space being provided in Genyn Road. Therefore, the recommended amendments will result in a net gain of around two spaces within Area B, both reserved for permit holders only.
- 2.17 Within Area F, the changes in the roads surrounding the hospital will result in the loss of five spaces in Bray Road (all limited waiting shared-use or permit F). However, it is proposed that an additional limited waiting shared-use or permit F space is introduced to compensate for this. Additionally, because of concerns raised by residents in the cul-de-sac section of Bray Road, to the south of its junction with Poltimore Road, it is proposed to convert part of the existing limited waiting shared-use or permit F bay there to permit F only. Therefore, whilst the recommended amendments will result in a net loss of four spaces within Area F, the number that are permit holders only will actually be increased by two spaces.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 In making the recommendations we have considered the amount of work that could be undertaken in a reasonable review period. It is difficult to assess the exact amount of work because we do not know the extent of issues and concerns about them until we are undertaking the work. Proposing controls over a geographic area tends to involve more consultation and presents more issues to resolve than introducing controls in a more isolated ad-hoc location.
- 3.2 If the Committee accepts the recommendations, the review will consist of considering seven geographic areas and 22 ad hoc locations.
- 3.3 The Committee could choose to progress more ad-hoc locations. However, this would extend the duration of the review and lead to a consequential knock-on effect of subsequent reviews. Alternatively, the Committee could decide to reduce the number of ad-hoc locations considered and this is likely to result in the review being completed earlier.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Prior to finalising the list of locations to be assessed, in January 2014 the police, parish councils and borough and county councillors were contacted to allow them to highlight any parking issues that have been brought to their attention, and which did not previously appear on the list.
- 4.2 We send the list again to borough and county councillors in August 2014 to allow them to comment.

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 that it will cost no more than £50,000. 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, not subject to loading restrictions, 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 Where necessary, we also work with our County Council colleagues to formalise advisory disabled parking spaces introduced by them for particular blue-badge-holding residents.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 At this point of the review, it is possible that any proposals subsequently developed could affect a great many wards, divisions and parishes outside the CPZ, and particularly road users and residents in those areas. All the proposals will be publicised, and we will consider the comments drawn from residents and local communities carefully considered.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below.
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 recommend that proposals be developed for the ad-hoc locations highlighted in ANNEXE 1 and paragraph 2.9. The proposals will be discussed with the affected ward and divisional councillors and the results will be reported to a future meeting of the Committee to acquire authority for them to be formally advertised.
- 9.2 Additionally, it is recommended to formally advertise the revised proposals shown in ANNEXE 2 to accommodate the changes to the access arrangements associated with the Farnham Road Hospital development, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the TRO will be made.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 We plan to undertake the initial informal stage of consultation associated with the geographic elements of this Non-CPZ review, during autumn 2014 and

winter 2014-5, with recommendations, to the March 2015 meeting of the Committee.

- 10.2 If the recommendation of this report is agreed we plan to also formally advertise the amendments associated with Farnham Road Hospital development (see ANNEXE 2) during the autumn 2014 and winter 2014/5. The development is due to be completed in May 2015. It is important that we complete the statutory process to allow changes to the parking restrictions within this timescale. If we receive representations, there will be time for the Committee to consider them.
- 10.3 If the recommendation of this report is agreed, proposals will be developed in the 22 ad-hoc locations, in consultation with the affected ward and divisional councillors during autumn 2014, winter 2014-5 and spring 2015. We plan to report the proposals to the June 2015 meeting of the Committee, where authority will be sought to advertise them with a view to making an order.

Contact Officer:

Andrew Harkin, On-street Parking Coordinator, Guildford Borough Council
(01483) 444535

Consulted:

Surrey Police
All Parish Councils within the borough
All ward and divisional members

Annexes:

- 1 – Preliminary assessment of requests for controls in ad-hoc locations
- 2 – Revised proposals around Farnham Road Hospital redevelopment

Sources/background papers:

- Item 9, Guildford Local Committee, 11 December 2013
-

This page is intentionally left blank