

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD).

DATE: TUESDAY 13 DECEMBER 2016



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

SUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW – CHANGES TO REVIEW PROCESS AND SCOPING REPORT

DIVISION(S): ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report presents recommendations for changing the way in which parking reviews are conducted and proposes the scope of the next review.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree:

- (i) that reviews are combined and deal with issues both in the CPZ and non-CPZs areas,
- (ii) that reviews are limited in scope to deal with around 50 items / locations, and prioritisation is given to safety issues,
- (iii) that permit schemes or changes to them are considered if residents can demonstrate a groundswell of opinion clearly in support of such amendments,
- (iv) that disabled bay, vehicle crossover and less controversial issues are fast-tracked, and formally advertised as early in the review process as possible,
- (v) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's intention to make an order to give effect to the proposals for Annandale Road, Duncan Drive, the Millmead Terrace area, The Oval and Vicarage Gate, shown in ANNEXE 5. If any representations are 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 develop and formally advertise Surrey County Council's intention to make an order to give effect to the proposals for, Alresford Road, Maori Road, St Omer Road, Sycamore Road, Upperton Road, Warren Road and Woodbridge Road, listed in Paragraph 2.15, If any representations are 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.

ITEM 9

- (vii) that officers discuss further with local borough and county councillors the possibility of making changes in respect to the 40 or so 'Local' issues shown in ANNEXE 4, and develop proposals in a number of these locations, to be reported back to the Committee in March 2017, with a view to seeking authority to formally advertise them.

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 To introduce or change a parking restriction Surrey County Council needs to follow a process set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) to create a Traffic Regulation Order. This requires the formal advertising of a proposal and for any comments or objections received to be considered before the restriction is introduced. If a comment or objection is received that requires the proposal to be changed significantly, the proposal is likely to need to be advertised again. For more complex or controversial proposals, it is useful to either conduct informal consultation before formally advertising the proposal, or have information to show a proposal is likely to be supported.
- 1.2 The number of parking issues raised means that there is a need for them to be considered in an efficient manner and prioritised. Therefore, rather than dealing with issues as and when they arise, they are considered collectively as part of parking reviews. This allows the committee approvals, drafting of legal documents, consultations, formal public notices and procuring contractors to implement the outcome to be done for a number of locations at the same time rather than individually for each issue. It also ensures that the various issues raised are considered more consistently and can be prioritised appropriately.
- 1.3 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). It was envisaged that each cycle would take 18 months to complete, with the implementation stage occurring during the last 6 months of the review. It was also anticipated that the last 6 months of one review would overlap with the first 6 months of the next review. Therefore, it was expected that a review would commence every year (see ANNEXE 1).
- 1.4 The reality has been somewhat different. The last review concerning issues within the CPZ was completed in August 2014. The most recent review, dealing with issues within the non-CPZ area was completed in November 2016.
- 1.5 On average, rather than taking around 18 months to complete, reviews have been taking two to two-and-a-half years to complete. Even so, the overlap between the reviews has tended to reduce the time between the start of one review and the next to around two years. Nevertheless, the practicalities of implementing one review whilst trying to progress the next has proved problematic. The commencement of a review has often raised expectations,

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose an item.](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose%20an%20item)

only for us to be unable to progress them due to the implementation phase(s) of the previous review. As a result, concerns have been raised about the duration of reviews.

- 1.6 Currently, there are around 350 parking issues which have been raised. The latter figure is despite the most recent review in the non-CPZ areas dealing with issues in over 100 locations.
- 1.7 Because reviews currently cycle between CPZ and non-CPZ, this means that if we do not progress an issue within one review, it may be several years before we will be able to consider it again. Due to these timescales, there has been a tendency for reviews to become 'overloaded', resulting in them taking longer than the 18-months anticipated.
- 1.8 To ensure that the introduction of formalised disabled bays and new vehicle crossovers that conflict with formalised restrictions could take place as soon as possible in September 2009 the Committee agreed that the consideration of these items could be considered whenever other restrictions were being implemented. Nevertheless, because of the extended duration of the reviews, and the fact that the implementation has generally occurred in one or two phases towards their end, this can still result in delays in implementing these necessary changes.
- 1.9 One option is to combine both CPZ and non-CPZ areas and considering the merits of all issues throughout the borough during each review. This, and prioritising safety issues, would ensure that those issues most deserving of action are progressed in a timely fashion, and regardless of their geographic locality.
- 1.10 Another issue that has arisen regularly has been the ability to implement changes necessary to accommodate developments. Previously, these were 'mopped-up' as part of the parking reviews. However, the delays involved have often led to dissatisfaction from developers and those that subsequently occupy the developments. Because of this, since the beginning of the last review, Parking Services has agreed with Surrey County Council's Transport Development Plans team that any changes to the formalised parking controls necessary to accommodate developments should form part of a planning agreement. This allows the changes to more closely coincide with the completion of the development. It also means that the costs associated with making the changes are borne by the developer.
- 1.11 Since the commencement of the last review, Surrey County Council (SCC) has reassessed the way in which it undertakes parking reviews elsewhere in the county.
- 1.12 To enable it to complete reviews more quickly, the County Council has decided to limit the scope of each review to dealing with issues in around 50 issues/locations. This is far fewer than the 110 locations Parking Services dealt with in its most recent review. Clearly, the need to consult and develop proposals in far fewer locations will help reduce the amount of time taken. However, it does mean that the Committee will need to be more selective about which issues it progresses. It also means that more issues are held over to the next review, albeit that the next review should occur sooner.

ITEM 9

- 1.13 To focus its resources more efficiently, the County Council also decided that, prior to considering parking schemes, or significant changes to existing ones, residents / businesses would have to demonstrate a significant support of such changes before they are considered as part of a review. Previously, issues raised by a relatively small number of people have been pursued, and large amounts for time spent consulting, only to find that there was not general support. This approach also means that reviews are responding to the wishes of communities. It is also likely to reduce the need to undertake informal consultation for some of the major amendments, instead allowing us to proceed straight to formal advertisement.
- 1.14 The reviews that Parking Services has previously undertaken within the borough of Guildford have been similarly affected. This has resulted in a great deal of time and effort being spent on unproductive work. This, and the large number of issues considered, has caused the reviews to become longer in duration.
- 1.15 In terms of the level of support necessary to trigger our consideration of a major change, the County Council took the view that at least 70% support from all frontages. However, it also agreed that there maybe exceptions where lower levels would be appropriate. A Parking Scheme Request Form has been developed specifically for this purpose (see ANNEXE 3). This is already available for the public to use via the Guildford Borough Council website.
- 1.16 The County Council has also decided that issues where safety is the main consideration issues should take priority over those solely associated with the availability of space.
- 1.17 Whilst dealing with the major, and more contentious issues takes time, there are some issues, such as disabled bays, amendments to accommodate vehicle crossovers and more minor yellow line and parking bay changes, which are less likely to be controversial. In previous reviews, such issues have often resulted in no representations, but have had to wait until the implementation phase(s), towards the end of each review, before being introduced.
- 1.18 One option would be to separate these from the major / contentious elements of the review, so that authority to advertise is acquired at the beginning of the review, or nearer its start. Any issues that subsequently generated significant comment could then drop into the major / contentious element of the review. It would also allow less contentious issues that arose during the course of the review to be considered later in the review, alongside the major / contentious issues.
- 1.19 Creating a 'fast-tack' for necessary changes, non-contentious issues or changes where a significant level of support had been demonstrated could derive tangible benefits for those requesting the changes. However, care would have to be taken to ensure that the proposed two phases of implementation, more evenly spread out during the course of the review, do not increase to three, or more. This could have implication in respect to the benefits of the economies of scale, and ultimately have a detrimental impact on the cost and duration of the reviews.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 Therefore, in respect to the review process, it is recommended the Committee agrees:
- a. that reviews are combined and deal with issues both in the CPZ and non-CPZs areas,
 - b. that reviews are limited in scope to deal with around 50 items / locations, and prioritisation is given to safety issues,
 - c. that permit schemes and changes to them are considered if residents / businesses effected can demonstrate significant support of such amendments,
 - d. that disabled bay, vehicle crossover and less controversial issues are fast-tracked, and formally advertised as early in the review process as possible.
- 2.2 An outline of the recommended review process is shown in ANNEXE 2.
- 2.3 A list of the issues raised, predominantly in the CPZ areas, appears in ANNEXE 4. These have been put in road order, summarised into the nature of the request, and whether the issue is a 'Local' one, or involves 'Area-wide' considerations.
- 2.4 'Local' issues involve the possibility of altering of one or two restrictions in a specific location.
- 2.5 'Area-wide' requests tend to involve the amendment of controls over wider areas, or fundamental changes to the way that the controls / permit scheme operates.
- 2.6 Additionally, some of the issues raised have involved the submission of organised requests from significant groups within particular areas. These submissions tend to involve more substantial 'Area-wide' changes, rather than 'Local' issues, although they can be both.
- 2.7 Furthermore, a number of 'Necessary' changes are required to accommodate new disabled bay requests, new and revised vehicle crossovers, and new developments that pre-date the arrangement whereby the developer enters a planning agreement with Surrey County Council's Transport Development Plans team.

Parking Scheme Request form submissions

- 2.8 A number of issues have been subject to organised requests from significant groups within the areas affected. These are:
- a. Annandale Road
 - b. Duncan Drive
 - c. Millmead Terrace area (Bury St, Bury Fields, Lawn Rd, Millmead Tr)
 - d. The Oval

ITEM 9

e. Vicarage Gate

- 2.9 Annandale Road – Residents from 7 of the 11 properties within the street have submitted a parking scheme request form suggested that parking associated with the school run of the nearby school, combined with the parking associated with the school's sixth form students, causes availability of space issues for residents and their visitors. Parking Services is also aware of another resident of the road that did not sign the form that has similar concerns. All the bays in Annandale Road are currently shared-use allowing a maximum stay of 2 hours for those who do not have a permit. The request asks for the bays on the east side of the road to be converted to permit-holders only.
- 2.10 Duncan Drive - Residents have been complaining for a long time about cars parked on both sides of the road. This narrows the carriageway often making its width insufficient for emergency access. At a meeting attended by a local councillor and an officer, residents reiterated their widely held concerns about parking close to the junction with Boxgrove Lane, and on both sides of the road elsewhere within Duncan Drive. The request asks for parking to be prohibited at Duncan Drive's junction with Boxgrove Lane, and on one side throughout the remainder of the road.
- 2.11 Millmead Terrace area - Residents have raised concerns about the availability of parking space outside the present operational hours of the prioritisation measures. It is suggested that these difficulties are caused by non-residents wishing to visit local destinations and avoid paying parking charges. There is overwhelming support within Millmead Terrace to increase prioritisation and extend the operational hours of the controls, including Sundays. A majority of respondents in Bury Fields and Bury Street are also supportive of some change, albeit not a clear majority of addresses. Although it may be possible to introduce localised measures in Millmead Terrace only, it may be more appropriate to amend the controls in the wider Bury Fields, Bury Street, Lawn Road and Millmead Terrace area. Doing so would make it possible to create of a distinct 'zone', in much the same way as we have previously done in the area around G-Live.
- 2.12 The Oval – Residents living between Nos.87 and 101 have raised concerns about the availability of space issues caused by non-residents and those who are able to work around the parking scheme without having to acquire a permit. Unlike most other properties in The Oval which have off-street parking, most of the properties concerned are wholly reliant on the availability of on-street parking. All the bays in The Oval are currently shared-use, allowing non-permit-holders the ability to park for up to 4 hours. The request asks for the first two parking spaces outside these properties to be converted to permit-holders only. The two bays outside Nos.87-101 would be the most appropriate.
- 2.13 Vicarage Gate – Resident have conducted a survey which shows that a significant majority of households would like the unrestricted parking bays in their road changed to prevent all-day parking by non-residents. Most residents have off-street parking but they would like to increase the availability for visitors, trades people and carers.
- 2.14 Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals shown in ANNEXE 5 are formally advertised.

‘Necessary’ changes

2.15 A number of the changes highlighted in ANNEXE 4 are ‘Necessary’ to accommodate new disabled bay requests, new and revised vehicle crossovers, and new developments that pre-date the arrangement whereby the developer enters a planning agreement with Surrey County Council’s Transport Development Plans team. In all cases, these ‘Necessary’ changes are also ‘Local’. These are:

- Alresford Road, Guildford (disabled bay request outside No.9),
- Maori Road, Guildford (amendments to parking bays and single yellow lines in vicinity of Lanesborough School to accommodate changes to the vehicular access arrangements resulting from a development),
- St Omer Road, Guildford (revisions to increase the setback distance from the lowered kerb to the parking bay outside No.17, following revisions to the extent of the lowered kerb),
- Sycamore Road, Guildford (TECHNICALITY – a previous development at No.25 Recreation Road has resulted in a change to the parking controls in Sycamore Road, without the necessary amendment of the traffic regulation order been made),
- Upperton Road, Guildford (disabled bay request in space closest to Guildford Park Road)
- Warren Road, Guildford (change of catchment area boundary to transfer a number of properties in the Epsom Road-Austin Road section of the road from Area I to Area C)
- Woodbridge Road, Guildford (removal of two pay and display only spaces to accommodate the vehicular access to the ‘pop up village’)

2.16 It is recommended that proposals for the locations listed above are developed and formally advertised.

‘Local’ issues

2.17 ANNEXE 4 identifies ‘Local’ issues, in addition to those referred to above as ‘Necessary’. With these localised requests for changes, we would not expect those proposing them to show they had support from other households because they only effect a limited area.

2.18 Therefore, it is recommended that officers discuss further with local borough and county councillors the possibility of making changes in respect to the ‘Local’ issues shown in ANNEXE 4, and develop proposals in a number of these. It is anticipated that the authority necessary to advertise the proposals subsequently developed as a result of these discussions will be sought at the March 2017 meeting of the Committee.

‘Area-wide’ issues

2.19 ANNEXE 4 also identifies over 100 individual requests for ‘Area-wide’ changes to the parking scheme. These requests relate to around 30 different ‘Area-wide’ issues in various localities.

ITEM 9

- 2.20 'Area-wide' issues raised include changes to the operational hours of the permit scheme, the prioritisation of spaces, and residents and visitors permit eligibility in various localities.
- 2.21 Because of this, in many cases, the 'Area-wide' issues raised may involve significant consultation. Conducting this, without any prior indication that there is actually significant support for change, could ultimately lead to a substantial amount of officer time being unproductive.
- 2.22 Therefore, in view of the above, it is recommended that the 'Area-wide' issues are not progressed until residents / businesses have demonstrated significant support for such amendments.

Size of the Proposed Review

- 2.22 Our recommendation for the forthcoming review is for it to include:
- (a) The five areas described in paragraphs 2.8 to 2.14, where residents have shown support for the proposed changes,
 - (b) The seven 'Necessary' changes described in paragraphs 2.15 and 2.16, and
 - (c) The 'Local' issues highlighted in Annexe 4 of which there are around 40. Not all of these will result in proposals for change but they will all be considered.
- 2.23 This produces a review of around 50 items. It not possible to say exactly how long the issues will take to resolve because they involve consultation but we would estimate the review will take around 18 months.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Committee needs to decide whether to adopt a review process that will hopefully speed up the reviews and address issues in a more timely fashion. Issues will primarily be progressed on the basis of need and the wishes of the communities in which they are situated.
- 3.2 The Committee also 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 circulated amongst local borough and county councillors before being reported 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.
- 3.3 If the Committee agrees the recommendations (v) and (vi), the intention would be to report any subsequently received representations to the June 2017 meeting of the Committee. If it subsequently agrees to introduce controls, it is likely that the first phase of implementation will take place by the end of 2017.
- 3.4 If the Committee agrees the recommendation (vii), the intention would be to report the developed proposals to the March 2017 meeting of the Committee, seeking authority to advertise. If it subsequently agrees to advertise and introduce controls, it is likely that the second phase of implementation will take place by mid-2018.

- 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 The list of issues contained within ANNEXE 4 has been circulated to relevant local borough and county councillors, and discussions held with a number of them about the scope of the review and the possible proposals.
- 4.2 Further discussions will be held with local borough and county councillors about the 'Local' issues to determine which can be progressed and result in the development of proposals.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 To undertake an appropriate level of consultation, create orders and implement changes to the signs and lines required to give affect to the proposals we estimate 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.
- 5.2 Existing resources will be used to conduct the consultations and the only additional expenditure will be printing and postage. Although public exhibitions are not anticipated, if the need arises, where possible they 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, local residents and businesses written to directly and any comments received given careful consideration.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose an item.](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose%20an%20item)

ITEM 9

	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 recommend the Committee agrees:
- (i) that reviews are combined and deal with issues both in the CPZ and non-CPZs areas,
 - (ii) that reviews are limited in scope to deal with around 50 items / locations, and prioritisation is given to safety issues,
 - (iii) that major schemes / changes are only considered if residents / businesses can demonstrate a groundswell of opinion clearly in support of such amendments,
 - (iv) that disabled bay, vehicle crossover and less controversial issues are fast-tracked, and formally advertised as early in the review process as possible,
 - (v) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's intention to make an order to give effect to the proposals for Annandale Road, Duncan Drive, the Millmead Terrace area, The Oval and Vicarage Gate, shown in ANNEXE 5. If any representations are 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 develop and formally advertise Surrey County Council's intention to make an order to give effect to the proposals for, Alresford Road, Maori Road, St Omer Road, Sycamore Road, Upperton Road, Warren Road and Woodbridge Road, listed in Paragraph 2.15. If any representations are 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.

- (vii) that officers discuss further with local borough and county councillors the possibility of making changes in respect to the 40 or so 'Local' issues shown in ANNEXE 4, and develop proposals in a number of these locations, to be reported back to the Committee in March 2017, with a view to seeking authority to formally advertise them.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to advertise the proposals set out in recommendations (v) and (vi), it is likely that this will take place early in 2017, with a view to reporting any recommendations back to the June 2017 meeting. This would involve publishing a public notice, erecting street notices, placing documentation on deposit and writing to those in the immediate vicinity of the proposals. The feedback will be discussed with local borough and county councillors prior to presenting a report to the June 2017 meeting.
- 10.2 In respect to the 'Local' issues set out in recommendations (vii), further discussions will be held with local borough and county councillors, and where appropriate, proposals developed, with a view to reporting these back to the March 2017 meeting, seeking authority to formally advertise them.

Contact Officer:

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

Consulted:

Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

- 1 - Current parking review flowchart
- 2 - Proposed parking review flowchart
- 3 - Parking scheme request form
- 4 - List of requests received
- 5 - Proposals developed for Annandale Road, Duncan Drive, the Millmead Terrace area, The Oval and Vicarage Gate

Sources/background papers:

- none
-

This page is intentionally left blank