

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD).



SURREY

DATE: WEDNESDAY 17 JUNE 2015

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

SUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW – PROPOSALS FOR GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

DIVISION(S): ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report presents the feedback from informal consultations undertaken in six geographic areas concerning the need for parking restrictions. The six areas are (i) Avondale Estate and the area around Ash Vale and North Camp Stations, (ii) Burpham shopping parade area including Burpham Lane, (iii) Effingham Junction, (iv) the Fairlands Estate, (v) Merrow and (vi) Shalford. The report recommends proposals are progressed to formal advertisement to seek comments, with the exception of Burpham, where it is recommended that there is further informal consultation on the proposal prior to finalising and advertising it.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree:

- (i) to formally advertise the proposals for the Avondale Estate and the area around Ash Vale and North Camp Stations, shown in ANNEXE 3, 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.
- (ii) to undertake further informal consultation, including public exhibitions, in the Burpham shopping parade area including Burpham Lane, on the basis of the draft proposals shown in ANNEXE 5, that the feedback from this be discussed with the affected ward and divisional councillors, and reported to a future meeting of the Committee to acquire authority for the resultant proposals to be formally advertised.
- (iii) to formally advertise the proposals for the Effingham Junction, shown in ANNEXE 7, 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.
- (iv) to formally advertise the proposals for the Fairlands estate, shown in ANNEXE 9, 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.

- (v) to formally advertise the proposals for the Merrow shopping parade area, shown in ANNEXE 11, 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.
- (vi) to formally advertise the proposals for the Shalford, shown in ANNEXE 13, 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 make local improvements.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 When the scope of the present parking review was determined, the Committee agreed to undertake informal consultations in six geographic areas. These were the Avondale Estate and the area around Ash Vale and North Camp stations, Burpham shopping parade area, Effingham Junction, Fairlands estate, Merrow shopping parade area and Shalford. Of these localities, only the Burpham shopping parade area and Fairlands estate currently have no formalised controls.
- 1.2 As part of the current review it was also agreed to develop proposals in a number of ad hoc locations. A report dealing with this element of the review appears as Item 16 in this meeting's agenda.
- 1.3 In autumn / winter 2014/5 we undertook consultations in the six geographic areas.
- 1.4 Across all six geographic areas we sent out a letter accompanied by a questionnaire and pre-paid reply envelope. We also gave recipients of the correspondence the option to respond using an online questionnaire. An outline of the likely timescales and a link to the Guildford Local Committee page on the County Council's website was also provided (see ANNEXE 1).
- 1.5 This report summarises the feedback received and recommends the next steps.

2. ANALYSIS:

Avondale Estate and the area around Ash Vale and North Camp stations

- 2.1 The consultation took place between 9 January and 6 February 2015. We wrote directly to 1,347 addresses in 27 roads, as well as Ash Parish Council

and the Avondale Management Company. Six of the roads consulted are private.

- 2.2 Overall, 428 responses were received. 24 of the responses were from unknown, or other addresses that we may not have written to directly. Therefore, 30% of all those written to responded. 22% of the feedback was submitted online. A spreadsheet summarising the feedback appears in ANNEXE 2.
- 2.3 Respondents in around half of the roads that form part of the public highway clearly indicated that there were parking issues in their road (61% overall). Respondents also indicated that the Monday to Friday 'commuter' times were primarily the most problematic, although evening and weekends were highlighted as being problematic by some. The latter were primarily situated within the Avondale Estate. When it came to whether there was a desire for controls (or changes to the existing), the overall levels of support reduced (49%). However, when respondents considered issues in neighbouring roads, and whether their road should be subject to controls if other were, support for controls increased (59%).
- 2.4 Roads that were mentioned a significant number of times by those from neighbouring roads included Avondale (19), Birch Way (23), Lysons Avenue (20), Newfield Road (35), Station Roads East (53) and West (38), Vale Road - service road (21) and Wentworth Crescent (37). This is broadly similar to the locations highlighted in unsolicited correspondence received prior to the commencement of the review.
- 2.5 Recurring themes that were raised included the issues caused by footway and verge parking (35 and 27, respectively), and that if a residents' parking scheme were to be introduced, that it should be free to residents (50). The need for additional parking facilities to service the needs of rail commuters was also raised repeatedly (21).
- 2.6 In terms of a solution, by far the most popular option (in 14 of the 27 roads) was the introduction or amendment of limited controls, such as yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and other strategic places.
- 2.7 As a result of this feedback, we have developed draft proposals. We have presented the feedback and draft proposals to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.8 Following on from this, officers recommend that the proposals shown in ANNEXE 3 are formally advertised.

Burpham shopping parade area including Burpham Lane

- 2.9 The consultation took place between 14 November and 12 December 2014. We wrote directly to 402 addresses in 12 roads, as well as the Burpham Community Association and the Burpham Neighbourhood Forum. Six of the roads consulted are private.
- 2.10 Overall, 148 responses were received. 36 of the responses were from unknown, or other addresses that we may not have written to directly. Therefore, 30% of all those written to responded. Within roads that form part of the public highway the figure was over 37%. 39% of the feedback was

ITEM 15

submitted online. A spreadsheet summarising the feedback appears in ANNEXE 4.

- 2.11 Respondents from Burpham Lane and Kingpost Parade / Barton Place (shopping parade) clearly indicated that there were parking issues in their road. Indeed, amongst the six roads that form part of the public highway, over 70% suggested that there were problems in their roads. When it came to whether there was a desire for controls, over 64% of respondents from roads that form part of the public highway supported their introduction.
- 2.12 Roads that were mentioned a significant number of times by those from neighbouring roads included Burpham Lane (54), Burnet Avenue (11) and the shopping parade (8). This is broadly similar to the locations highlighted in unsolicited correspondence received prior to the commencement of the review.
- 2.13 Additionally, the comments about Burpham Lane also related to its section beyond the bend towards Clay Lane, and not just the area we consulted with directly.
- 2.14 Recurring themes that were raised included the school and issues associated with the school run and the difficulties faced by those wishing to walk to and from school. The loss of the bus service in Burpham Lane also featured, as did the speed of traffic using the road and the availability of parking space within the shopping parade.
- 2.15 Arriva buses have confirmed that the decision to re-route of the bus service from Burpham Lane was an economic one aimed at increasing patronage. They have also confirmed that, despite the Aldi development, they have no plans to reinstate the service in Burpham Lane.
- 2.16 In terms of a solution, the most popular option was the introduction of limited controls (nearly 26%), such as yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and other strategic places. However, within the shopping parade there was a desire for parking to be prioritised to improve the turnover of space and its availability for visitors.
- 2.17 As a result of this feedback, we have developed draft proposals. We have presented the feedback and draft proposals to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.18 However, much of the parking at the Kingpost Parade end of the shopping area is private. There is also a mix of business and residential properties within the parade. Because of the complexities associated with this, rather than formally advertising the proposals shown in ANNEXE 5 straight away, officers recommend that an additional round of informal consultation is undertaken to extract further opinion. This will include a public exhibition.
- 2.19 Please also note that, separately, the County Council's Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding has agreed to advertise a parking proposals associated with the Aldi development. These involve the section of Burpham Lane towards its London Road end. These are due to be advertised shortly and implemented to coincide with the opening of the stored in September 2015. These proposals are highlighted in grey on the proposals shown in ANNEXE 5.

Effingham Junction

- 2.20 The consultation took place between 14 November and 12 December 2014. We wrote directly to 247 addresses in seven roads, as well as East Horsley Parish Council. Three of the roads consulted are private.
- 2.21 Overall, 98 responses were received. Seven of the responses were from unknown, or other addresses that we may not have written to directly. Therefore, nearly 38% of all those written to responded. Within roads that form part of the public highway the figure was 41%. 21% of the feedback was submitted online. A spreadsheet summarising the feedback appears in ANNEXE 6.
- 2.22 Only respondents in Old Lane clearly indicated that there were parking issues in their road (92%). The same was true when it came to whether there was a desire for controls (88%). Even so, within roads that form part of the public highway, overall nearly 56% suggested there were problems in their road, and over 52% wanted controls in their road, if other roads were subject to controls.
- 2.23 Roads that were mentioned a number of times by those from neighbouring roads included Old Lane (30), Effingham Common Road (5) and Forest Road (4). This broadly similar to the locations highlighted in unsolicited correspondence received prior to the commencement of the review.
- 2.24 Recurring themes that were raised included the issues caused during the day by rail commuters in Effingham Common Road and Old Lane. The issues caused at night and during the weekend by parking overspill from the Copthorne Close development in Old Lane, and its service road, were also raised.
- 2.25 In terms of a solution, of the roads that form part of the public highway, the most popular option (with over 32%) was the introduction or amendment of limited controls, such as yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and other strategic places. However, residents' parking was favoured by a significant minority in the service road within Old Lane.
- 2.26 As a result of this feedback, we have developed draft proposals. We have presented the feedback and draft proposals to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.27 Following on from this, officers recommend that the proposals shown in ANNEXE 7 are formally advertised.

Fairlands estate

- 2.28 The consultation took place between 9 January and 6 February 2015. We wrote directly to 573 addresses in 15 roads, as well as to Worplesdon Primary School, the Fairlands Liddington Hall Gravetts Lane Community Association and Worplesdon Parish Council. None of the roads consulted are private.
- 2.29 Overall, 360 responses were received. 61 of the responses were from unknown, or other addresses that we may not have written to directly. Therefore, over 52% of all those written to responded. 33% of the feedback was submitted online. A spreadsheet summarising the feedback appears in ANNEXE 8.

- 2.30 Only respondents in Louis Fields and Wallace Close clearly indicated that there were parking issues in their road (80% and 66%, respectively), but this did not translate to a desire to see the introduction of parking controls. Overall, a majority of respondents in the roads consulted disagreed that their road had parking issues (59%), and disagreed with controls being introduced in their own roads (73%).
- 2.31 Overall however, nearly 45% of respondents suggested that there were issues in neighbouring roads. 92 respondents suggested that there were issues at school times, either in their own road, or neighbouring roads within the estate. There was a particular focus on the roads in and around the school and shopping parade. This included comments about Brocks Drive (24), Brooke Forest (41), Envis Way (55), Fairlands Avenue (30), Louis Fields (56), school area in general (73) and shop area in general (37). Additionally, within in some of the longer roads that opposed the introduction of controls overall, opposition tended to reduce amongst respondents that were nearer the school and shops.
- 2.32 Recurring themes that were raised included parking around the school (177), a desire to see no change (71), parking around the shops (59), parking on footways and grass verges (47), enforcement (32) and the cost (to residents) of any measures (26).
- 2.33 Therefore, although a clear majority opposed controls in their own roads, respondents expressed more general concerns about parking associated with the school and shops. This is broadly similar to the issues highlighted in unsolicited correspondence received prior to the commencement of the review.
- 2.34 In terms of a solution, by far the most popular option (in 13 of the 15 roads) was the introduction or amendment of limited controls, such as yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and other strategic places.
- 2.35 As a result of this feedback, we have developed draft proposals. We have presented the feedback and draft proposals to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.36 Following on from this, officers recommend that the proposals shown in ANNEXE 9 are formally advertised.

Merrow shopping parade area

- 2.37 The consultation took place between 14 November and 12 December 2014. We wrote directly to 349 addresses in 14 roads, as well as the Merrow and Fairway Residents' Associations. Five of the roads consulted are private.
- 2.38 Overall, 129 responses were received. Eight of the responses were from unknown, or other addresses that we may not have written to directly. Therefore, almost 35% of all those written to responded. Within roads that form part of the public highway the figure was slightly lower, at around 32%. Almost 20% of the feedback was submitted online. A spreadsheet summarising the feedback appears in ANNEXE 10.
- 2.39 Respondents from Epsom Road, Merrow Street and Sadlers Close clearly indicated that there were parking issues in their road and that they wanted controls (or changes to the existing). Across the roads that form part of the public highway, around 51% suggested that there were problems in their roads. When it came to whether there was a desire for controls, over 64% of

respondents from roads that form part of the public highway supported their introduction.

- 2.40 Roads that were mentioned a significant number of times by those from neighbouring roads included Merrow Street (37), Epsom Road (16) and Bushy Hill Drive (13).
- 2.41 Recurring themes that were raised included issues in finding spaces in Epsom Road and parking in Merrow Street near to its junctions with Epsom Road, the allotment car park and Sadlers Close.
- 2.42 In terms of a solution, the most popular option was the introduction of limited controls (nearly 42%), such as yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and other strategic places. However, in respect to the shopping parade, where there are already controls, there was a desire for parking to be prioritised to improve the turnover of space and its availability for visitors.
- 2.43 As a result of this feedback, we have developed draft proposals. We have presented the feedback and draft proposals to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.44 Therefore, officers recommend that the proposals shown in ANNEXE 11 are formally advertised.

Shalford

- 2.45 The consultation took place between 14 November and 12 December 2014. We wrote directly to 636 addresses in 23 roads, as well as the Shalford Parish Council. Nine of the roads consulted do not form part of the public highway.
- 2.46 Overall, 222 responses were received. 16 of the responses were from unknown, or other addresses that we may not have written to directly. Therefore, over 32% of all those written to responded. Within roads that form part of the public highway the figure was slightly higher, at nearly 34%. Around 18% of the feedback was submitted online. A spreadsheet summarising the feedback appears in ANNEXE 12.
- 2.47 Respondents from Atherton Close, Chinthurst Lane, The Common, Kings Road, Station Road and Weald Close clearly indicated that there were parking issues in their road. Across the roads that form part of the public highway, nearly 56% suggested that there were problems in their roads. However, only 30% of respondents from these roads supported the introduction, or amendment of controls. This rose to 58% if other roads were subject to controls.
- 2.48 Roads that were mentioned a significant number of times by those from neighbouring roads included Chinthurst Lane (33), Kings Road (27), Station Road (43) and Tillingbourne Road (11).
- 2.49 Recurring themes that were raised included the lack of available parking near the shops (primarily in Kings Road), the difficulties that parked vehicles cause to the flow of traffic in Chinthurst Lane and the issues around various junctions in Station Road and Tillingbourne Road. This is broadly similar to the issues highlighted in unsolicited correspondence received prior to the commencement of the review.

- 2.50 In terms of a solution, the most popular option was the introduction of limited controls (nearly 44%), such as yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and other strategic places. However, in respect to the area around the shops, there was a desire for parking to be prioritised to improve the turnover of space and its availability for visitors.
- 2.51 As a result of this feedback, we have developed draft proposals. We have presented the feedback and draft proposals to the local ward and divisional councillors.
- 2.52 Therefore, officers recommend that the proposals shown in ANNEXE 13 are formally advertised.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Committee needs to decide whether to advertise the proposals as recommended, make changes, or not to progress some, or all of the proposals. After a proposal is advertised any comments or objections received would be report to the Committee and a decision taken whether to implement the proposals, or implement less restrictive proposals. If there was a wish to increase the amount of restriction as a result of comments received, the proposals would have to be advertised again. The recommended proposals have been discussed, and in some cases have already been amended, as a result of the discussions with local ward and divisional councillors.
- 3.2 In the case of the Burpham shopping parade area, the Committee needs to decide whether to undertake additional informal consultation, before deciding whether to formally advertise proposals at a future meeting.
- 3.3 Another round of informal consultation adds time to the process and delays the implementation of any resulting proposals. However, with Burpham there are a number of complications including the construction of the Aldi supermarket and the fact that part of Kingspost Parade is privately owned.
- 3.4 If the Committee agrees the recommendations, it is likely that the formal advertisement and additional informal consultation (in the case of Burpham shopping parade area) will take place in early autumn 2015, after the school summer holidays. The intention would be to report any subsequently received representations / feedback to the December 2015 meeting of the Committee.
- 3.5 The Committee could choose not to formally advertise the proposals. However, the issues that have been raised, and in many cases confirmed by the informal consultation, would remain unresolved.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Consultation letters and questionnaires have been distributed to over 3,500 addresses, and various other interested parties such as parish council, community organisations and residents' associations.

- 4.2 The feedback and proposals have been circulated to relevant local ward and divisional councillors.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 We anticipate that the overall cost of the current review will not be more than £50,000 and this can be met from on-street parking surplus. This figure covers both the geographic element of the review, which forms the topic of this item, and also the ad hoc element of the review. The precise amount will ultimately depend on the number of locations where we subsequently introduce controls.
- 5.2 Existing resources will be used to conduct the consultations and the only additional expenditure will be postage. Where possible, any public exhibitions will be held at Council facilities.

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.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The proposals will affect all road users in the areas where amendments are proposed and particularly residents. The proposals will be publicised and the comments received given 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 and where large vehicles utilise relatively narrow roads.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 We have carefully considered the feedback received and recommend the Committee agrees:
 - (i) to formally advertise the proposals for the Avondale Estate and the area around Ash Vale and North Camp Stations, shown in ANNEXE 3, 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.
 - (ii) to undertake further informal consultation, including public exhibitions, in the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, on the basis of the draft proposals shown in ANNEXE 5, that the feedback from this be discussed with the affected ward and divisional councillors, and reported to a future meeting of the Committee to acquire authority for the resultant proposals to be formally advertised.
 - (iii) to formally advertise the proposals for the Effingham Junction, shown in ANNEXE 7, 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.
 - (iv) to formally advertise the proposals for the Fairlands estate, shown in ANNEXE 9, 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.
 - (v) to formally advertise the proposals for the Merrow shopping parade area, shown in ANNEXE 11, 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.
 - (vi) to formally advertise the proposals for the Shalford, shown in ANNEXE 13, 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.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to formally advertise the proposals, it is likely that the formal advertisement will take place in early autumn 2015, after the school summer holidays. This would involve publishing a public notice, erecting street notices, placing documentation on deposit and writing again to all those previously written to. The intention would be to report any subsequently received representations to the December 2015 meeting of the Committee. If we were to subsequently implement any controls, this is expected to take place in mid-2016.
- 10.2 In the case of the Burpham shopping parade area, if the Committee agrees to conduct further informal consultation, it is likely that this would take place in early autumn 2015, after the school summer holidays. This would involve a public exhibition. The intention would be to report the feedback received to the December 2015 meeting of the Committee. If the Committee agreed to formally advertise proposals, this would take place in early 2016. It is anticipated that any representation subsequently received would be reported to the June 2016 meeting of the Committee. If we were to subsequently implement any controls, this is expected to take place in mid-to-late-2016.

Contact Officer:

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

Consulted:

Surrey Police
Residents
Businesses
Community groups and residents' associations
Parish Councils
Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

- 1 - (Generic) Consultation letter and questionnaire.
- 2 - Initial questionnaire survey feedback – Avondale estate and area around Ash Vale and North Camp stations.
- 3 - Proposals for Avondale estate and area around Ash Vale and North Camp stations.
- 4 - Initial questionnaire survey feedback – Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane.
- 5 - Proposals for Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane.
- 6 - Initial questionnaire survey feedback – Effingham Junction.
- 7 - Proposals for Effingham Junction.
- 8 - Initial questionnaire survey feedback – Fairlands estate.
- 9 - Proposals for Fairlands estate.
- 10 - Initial questionnaire survey feedback – Merrow shopping parade area.
- 11 - Proposals for Merrow shopping parade area.
- 12 - Initial questionnaire survey feedback – Shalford.
- 13 - Proposals for Shalford.

ITEM 15

Sources/background papers:

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