

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD).

DATE: THURSDAY 6 JULY 2017



LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW HARKIN, ON STREET PARKING CO-ORDINATOR

SUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW –
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND AUTHORITY
TO IMPLEMENT PROPOSALS

DIVISION(S): GUILDFORD SOUTHEAST
GUILDFORD SOUTHWEST

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report presents the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals for new or changed parking restrictions in Annandale Road, Duncan Drive, the Millmead area, The Oval and Vicarage Gate. The Committee is asked to consider the comments received and decide whether or not to make traffic regulation orders needed to introduce the proposals.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree:

- (i) That, having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls and changes to the existing as shown in ANNEXE 3, but that the proposals in Vicarage Gate are not progressed at the present time.

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 At its meeting held on 13 December 2016 the Committee agreed to amend the way that Parking Services conducts its reviews and streamline the process. It also agreed the scope of the present review and that there should be two streams of work. The first were includes proposals where there appeared to be strong support for change or necessary change. These areas are listed

below and are the subject of this report.

- Alresford Road, Annandale Road, Duncan Drive, Maori Road, Millmead area (including Bury Fields, Bury Street, Lawn Road and Millmead Terrace), St Omer Road, Sycamore Road, The Oval, Upperton Road, Vicarage Gate, Woodbridge Road,
- 1.2 The report presents the representations resulting from the advertisement of proposals in the locations highlighted in 1.1.
- 1.3 The Committee also agreed to develop proposals in a number of other locations, in consultation with the local borough and county councillors. These proposals were subsequently developed, agreed at the Committee's 22 March 2017 meeting, and the formal advertisement is imminent. The locations involved are:
 - Alresford Road, Artillery Terrace, Brodie Road, Chantry View Road, Chapel Street, Cline Road, Downside Road, Elmside, Epsom Road, Jenner Road, Josephs Road, Linden Road, Lower Edgeborough Road, Mountside, One Tree Hill Road, Pewley Hill, Quarry Street, Queens Road, South Hill, Spiceall (Compton), Stocton Close, Stoke Road, The Oval (Wood Street Village), Tormead Road and Warren Road.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The formal advertisement of proposals for the areas listed in 1.1 took place between 10 and 31 March 2017. The proposals encompassed one geographic area (Millmead area), and 10 other locations. A number of these locations are associated with accommodating disabled bays, vehicle crossovers and improving access arrangements for new and existing developments.
- 2.2 We wrote directly to over 600 addresses. A public notice was also published in the Surrey Advertiser newspaper. Additionally, over 100 street notices were erected in and around the proposed locations. The legal notices and supporting documentation were made available to view at all four deposit centres within the borough (Millmead House, Guildford Library, Ash Library and Horsley Library). The letter and street notices provided a link to the Borough Councils' website. This gave those that were unable to visit the deposit centres an opportunity to view the proposals, supporting documentation and submit comments online.
- 2.3 The page on Guildford Borough Council's website received around 250 'hits'. Overall, 72 representations were received. Over 90% of the representations were submitted online. The majority of the proposals received representations. Indeed, only those in Sycamore Road and Woodbridge Road did not.
 - Alresford Road, Guildford (1 representation)
 - Annandale Road, Guildford (5 representations)
 - Duncan Drive, Guildford (10 representations)
 - Maori Road, Guildford (3 representations)
 - Millmead area, Guildford (40 representations)
 - Bury Fields

- Bury Street
 - Lawn Road
 - Millmead Terrace
 - St Omer Road, Guildford (1 representation)
 - Sycamore Road, Guildford (No representations)
 - The Oval, Guildford (2 representations, including a 14-signature petition)
 - Upperton Road, Guildford (1 representation)
 - Vicarage Gate, Guildford (10 representations)
 - Woodbridge Road, Guildford (No representations)
- 2.4 A table summarising the representations appears in ANNEXE 1. To help gain an overall impression of the feedback we have analysed the comments. Therefore, ANNEXE 1 also details our view of whether the comments were supportive or opposed to the proposals. We have also categorised those comments generally supportive and generally opposed, and where changes were suggested, described their general nature. This analysis is presented to provide a general impression of the feedback received, but it is important that each representation is considered.
- 2.5 The full representations, with officer comments, are shown in ANNEXE 2.
- Alresford Road (convert limited waiting shared-use parking place outside No.9 to disabled badge holders only parking place)**
- 2.6 We wrote directly to 12 addresses in and around Alresford Road.
- 2.7 We received 1 representation. This was from a resident of Alresford Road and offered support of the proposal.
- 2.8 The representation was distributed to local borough and county councillors. They expressed support for the officer recommendation to implement the proposal as advertised.
- 2.9 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.
- Annandale Road (convert limited waiting shared-use parking bays on the east side of the road to permit only parking bays)**
- 2.10 Prior to the review, a request from the 7 properties on the east side of the road asked for the bays on their side of the road to be converted to permit-holders only. All the permit holders within the road reside on its east side.
- 2.11 As part of the formal consultation, we wrote directly to all 11 addresses in Annandale Road, as well as a further 18 addresses in nearby roads.
- 2.12 We received 5 representations. All were either residents of Annandale Road or the surrounding area. There were 3 comments stating support for the proposals, 1 offering general support, and 1 which suggested that any changes would have minimal effect on the parking situation. There were no representations objecting to the proposal.
- 2.13 The proposal involves converting the limited waiting shared-use spaces on the east side of the road to permit only. The generally supportive representation

wanted more restrictive controls to be introduced on the west side of the road. However, the demand on space by permit holders would not warrant greater restriction at the present time. Furthermore, increasing the level of restriction on both sides of the road would reduce the flexibility of residents and their visitors. It would also invariably lead to greater displacement by non-residents into the adjacent area.

- 2.14 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors. All of those that responded expressed support for the officer recommendation to implement the proposal as advertised.
- 2.15 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Duncan Drive (introduce various lengths of double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction on both sides of the road)

- 2.16 Prior to the review, residents held a meeting. A local councillor and the Parking Manager attended. At the meeting, residents reiterated their widely held concerns about parking close to the junction with Boxgrove Road, and on both sides of the road elsewhere within Duncan Drive. Particular concerns were raised about parking in the evening and at weekends.
- 2.17 As part of the formal consultation, we wrote directly to all 21 addresses in Duncan Drive.
- 2.18 We received 10 representations. There were 5 comments stating support for the proposals, 3 offering general support, and 2 stated opposition. The 8 offering varying degrees of support were all from Duncan Drive. Of the 2 stating opposition, one came from a nearby road and the other came from a parent of a pupil that attends Boxgrove Primary School.
- 2.19 The proposal involves introducing double yellow lines in Duncan Drive close to its junctions with Boxgrove Road and Collingwood Crescent, and along one side of the road throughout its length, to prevent issues caused by parking on both sides. Of the 3 representations that were generally supportive, all wanted more restrictive controls. The proposed restrictions have been developed to take into account the fact that the road is a bus route. Consequently, the proposed restrictions already extend further than would normally be the case.
- 2.20 Of the 2 representations opposed, both questioned the need for any restrictions, and the potential impact that controls might have on the availability of space for motorists and the possible impact on neighbouring roads. Ongoing concerns have been raised about the parking situation in Duncan Drive, particularly in the evenings and at weekends. The proposals aim to address these, whilst also attempting to maintain sufficient parking in the vicinity to help minimise the potential for displacement.
- 2.21 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors.
- 2.22 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Maori Road (amend parking bays and introduce single yellow line waiting restrictions to accommodate changes to the access arrangements at Lanesborough School associated with its redevelopment)

- 2.23 We wrote directly to 17 addresses in Maori Road.
- 2.24 We received 3 representations. There was 1 comment of general opposition and 2 stated opposition.
- 2.25 The proposals are intended to amend the controls to accommodate newly created points of access associated with a recent redevelopment of Lanesborough School. Therefore, the changes are primarily limited to facilitating these. Additionally, minor changes are proposed within the bays to help maintain the number of short-stay spaces. These assist with the school run. The generally opposed comment came from a resident of Maori Road who wanted more restrictive controls to be introduced to prevent all long-stay parking by non-permit-holders and to better protect driveways. The 2 representations stating opposition came from non-residents concerned about the loss of facility for those parking all-day.
- 2.26 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors.
- 2.27 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Millmead area (increase prioritisation of space for permit holders through increasing the number of permit only spaces [Millmead Terrace] and extending the operational hours of the controls to include evenings and Sundays)

- 2.28 Prior to the review, local residents conducted a survey of opinions amongst those living in Bury Street, Bury Fields, Lawn Road and Millmead Terrace. This demonstrated support for greater prioritisation of space for permit holders, including extended operational hours to include evenings and Sundays. There was overwhelming support within Millmead Terrace. A majority of respondents in Bury Fields and Bury Street were also supportive of some change, albeit not a clear majority of addresses. The proposals aim to create a distinct 'zone' within Bury Fields, Bury Street, Lawn Road and Millmead Terrace. This would be similar to the one previously introduced in the area around G-Live.
- 2.29 As part of the formal consultation, we wrote directly to 340 addresses in Bury Fields, Bury Street, Lawn Road, Millmead Terrace and Portsmouth Road.
- 2.30 We received 40 representations. There were 8 comments stating support for the proposals, 9 offering general support, 7 generally opposed and 16 stated opposition.
- 2.31 Of the 9 that were generally supportive, 5 wanted more restrictive controls, whilst 4 wanted less restrictive controls. Of the 7 generally opposed, all wanted less restrictive controls. Although some residents stated opposition, the majority of those that did were non-residents that attend the local churches, evening classes and school parents.
- 2.32 Because the proposal involved a number of potential changes, the feedback for the area was broken down into more detail. This information also appears in ANNEXE 1. There were four main themes regarding the detailed comments. These were evening controls, Sunday controls, more permit only parking and the proposals for double yellow lines opposite the garages below Condor Court.

- 2.33 In respect to evening controls, a similar number of respondents were supportive (17) / opposed (17). Residents of Bury Fields (7) and Millmead Terrace (7) were supportive. Non-residents, such as those attending the local churches / evening classes were opposed (12). Additionally, there were two households in Lawn Road opposed to evening controls. These both came from Chaucer Court. This development has a number of garages and a forecourt. However, there is some ‘overspill’ parking onto the highway from those that may not be eligible for permits. The evening restrictions would reduce the flexibility of the scheme for them, albeit that the limited waiting shared-use spaces would still be available for their use.
- 2.34 With regard to Sunday controls, a similar number of respondents were supportive (16) / opposed (18). Again, residents of Bury Fields (6) and Millmead Terrace (7) were supportive. Non-residents, particularly those attending the local churches, were opposed (12). Nevertheless, the limited waiting shared-use spaces would still be available for their use.
- 2.35 The proposals intend to make all the bays within Millmead Terrace permit only. All the existing limited waiting shared-use bays around the Bury Fields surgery, outside the Almshouses in Bury Street, and within Lawn Road are to remain limited waiting shared-use, albeit that it is proposed that they will be restricted over a longer period. Again, residents of Bury Fields (8) and Millmead Terrace (6) were supportive. Indeed, some residents of Bury Fields wanted a number of the bays closer to the Bury Fields Clinic to be made permit only. Clearly, there is still a need to accommodate the needs of its visitors. Non-residents, particularly school parents, those attending the local churches and evening classes were opposed to the proposal. The proposals will still retain a significant number limited waiting shared-use spaces, albeit that their number will reduce from 50 to 35. Conversely, the number of permit only spaces will increase from 33 to 48. There are currently 84 residents’ permit holders within the locality.
- 2.36 Parking currently takes place on the single yellow line in Millmead Terrace, opposite the garages below Condor Court, outside the present restriction’s hours of operation. Because of the width of the road, this broadly renders the garages impractical to use. This may not have been the case in the late 1960s when the smaller size of cars combined with the current single yellow line, still allowed the garages to be used.
- 2.37 11 of the 14 garages are now associated with the Bellairs development. Their acquisition led to the Borough Council removing the planning condition for the developer to provide a car club for those residing at the development. Nevertheless, Surrey County Council, in partnership with City Car and Guildford Borough Council, has subsequently provided a car club space independently. This initiative aims to reduce residents’ reliance on private vehicles.
- 2.38 7 of the 11 garage owners currently hold permits for their first vehicles, due to the garages being impractical to use. The intention is to make the garages more accessible. Whilst this would potentially remove the ability for around 10 vehicles to park on-street opposite the garages, it will allow up to 14 garages owners to use their garages. In turn, this will allow us to remove the temporary permit eligibility that we have offered the garage owners, reducing the number of permit holders, which currently stands at 84, to 77. The increased

prioritisation of space elsewhere, should further free up space for permit-holders, particularly in the evenings and on Sundays.

- 2.39 Although, concerns have been raised that the double yellow lines will be broadly ignored and the garage-owners will still require permits, enforcement of the parking bay restrictions over an extended period will result in greater enforcement at the times when the double yellow lines are in operation. This should improve compliance with the proposed restriction.
- 2.40 Whilst the 3 garages opposite No.4-6 Millmead Terrace are not associated with the Bellairs development, they could be used by vehicles were accessibility improved. Therefore, given the proposed protection opposite the other garages, it would also be appropriate to prevent parking opposite these ones too.
- 2.41 The household at No.7 Millmead Terrace opposes the conversion of the single yellow lines to double yellow lines, including the change proposed to the single yellow line outside their property on the basis that evening parking is usually by residents. Whilst the particular section of carriageway outside their house is not situated opposite a garage, the 8-metre length of single yellow line along the property's frontage protects the access to No.7's off-street parking facilities. This length also provides access to the on-street parking bay situated on the bend 90-degree bend within the road. Therefore, parking on the single yellow line adjacent to this parking bay could restrict its use. Furthermore, if this particular section were to remain as a single yellow line, it may encourage other motorists to park there, potentially causing accessibility issues for the household at No.7.
- 2.42 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors. All of those that responded expressed support for the officer recommendation to implement the proposal as advertised.
- 2.43 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

St Omer Road (curtail parking bay slightly to accommodate extended vehicle crossover at No.17)

- 2.44 We wrote directly to 7 addresses in St Omer Road.
- 2.45 We received 1 representation. Although the person making the representation queried why there are parking bays on both sides of the road in this particular section of St Omer Road, they were supportive of the proposal.
- 2.46 The representation was distributed to local borough and county councillors.
- 2.47 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

The Oval (convert two bays outside Nos.87-101 from limited waiting shared-use to permit only)

- 2.48 Prior to the review, a 35-signature petition was received from 23 households within the area. 18 of these signatories were from 11 households within The Oval. The others predominantly came from residents of Dray Court and Palmers Lodge. The request asked for the first two parking spaces outside Nos.87-101 to be converted to permit-holders only.

- 2.49 As part of the formal consultation, we wrote directly to 24 addresses within The Oval and a further 10 in The Chase, nearest the proposed amendments.
- 2.50 We received 2 representations. This included a 14-signature petition from 12 households. Both representations came from those living in and around The Oval and both offered full support for the proposals.
- 2.51 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors. They expressed support for the officer recommendation to implement the proposal as advertised.
- 2.52 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Upperton Road (convert part of limited waiting shared-use parking bay to a disabled holders only parking place)

- 2.53 We wrote directly to 37 addresses in and around Upperton Road.
- 2.54 We received 1 representation. This was from a resident of Upperton Road. Although the representee had various queries about the parking scheme and made a number of suggestions about how it should operate in their area, they were supportive of the proposal.
- 2.55 The representation was distributed to local borough and county councillors. All of those that responded expressed support for the officer recommendation to implement the proposal as advertised.
- 2.56 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised.

Vicarage Gate (convert free unrestricted parking places to limited waiting share-use parking places)

- 2.57 Prior to the review Cllr Phillips received a petition from a number of residents of Vicarage Gate. They expressed a wish for all the unrestricted parking bays within Vicarage Gate to be converted to limited waiting shared-use. This was reported to the December 2016 meeting of the Committee.
- 2.58 As part of the formal consultation, we wrote directly to all 18 addresses within Vicarage Gate and a similar number of addresses in nearby Litchfield Way.
- 2.59 Overall, we received 9 representations. There were 3 comments stating support for the proposals and 6 stated opposition.
- 2.60 All 3 of the representees stating support were from Vicarage Gate. Of those that stated opposition, 1 was from a resident of Vicarage Gate and the other 5 were from residents of Litchfield Way.
- 2.61 All properties within Vicarage Gate have off-street parking facilities. Indeed, only one household within the road currently holds a residents' permit. Therefore, there would appear to be little demand for on-street parking from the residents themselves. By contrast, households within Litchfield Way are more reliant on on-street parking. Indeed, within the section closest to Vicarage Gate, there are a number of households that have no off-street parking facilities. Presently, they can use the unrestricted on-street spaces within the area without having to acquire a permit. Whilst the removal of the

unrestricted bays within Vicarage Gate would eliminate a risk of all-day parking associated with non-residents, it would also reduce the flexibility of the scheme for local residents and their visitors.

- 2.62 Therefore, officers recommend that this particular proposal is not progressed at the present time, so local residents without off-street parking can continue to use the parking bays with a greater degree of flexibility.
- 2.63 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors. They expressed support for the officer recommendation not to implement the proposal.
- 2.64 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees not to implement the proposal. Nevertheless, future reviews may provide the opportunity to revisit the situation.

Other locations

- 2.65 We wrote directly to 41 addresses in and around Sycamore Road and 44 addresses in Woodbridge Road.
- 2.66 No representations were received. Nevertheless, local borough and county councillors were made aware of this fact.
- 2.67 Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee agrees to implement the proposal as advertised in Sycamore Road and Woodbridge Road.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Committee needs to decide whether to implement the proposals as recommended, make changes, or not to progress some, or all of the proposals. If there was a desire to increase the amount of restriction as a result of comments received, the proposals would have to be advertised again. The representations and controls recommended for implementation have been distributed to local borough and county councillors.
- 3.2 If the Committee agrees the recommendation, it is likely that the implementation will take place by the end of 2017.
- 3.3 The Committee could choose not to make the orders. However, the issues that have been raised, and in many cases confirmed by the consultations, would remain unresolved.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 An advertisement has appeared in the Surrey Advertiser, letters associated with the formal consultations have been distributed to over 600 addresses and notices put up in the roads affected. There have been around 250 'hits' on the associated pages on Guildford Borough Council's website. Statutory consultees have also been notified.

- 4.2 The feedback and proposals detailed in ANNEXES 2 and 3 have been circulated to relevant local borough and county councillors.

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 effect to the proposals we estimate will cost no more than £11,000. The Committee needs to know the likely cost of what it is being asked to agree to – not a broad estimate for the whole review. 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 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, having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls and changes to the existing as shown in ANNEXE 3, but that the proposals in Vicarage Gate are not progressed at the present time.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals set out in recommendation (i), it is likely that this will take place in late 2017.
- 10.2 The advertisement of the proposals agreed at the Committee's March 2017 meeting is imminent. Depending on the response, a report will be brought to either the September, or December 2017 meeting. Before submitting a report, the feedback from this process will be distributed local borough and county councillors, and if required, discussions held with them. If the Committee subsequently agrees to implement those proposals, their introduction is anticipated in early to mid-2018. This will complete the review in the within the 18-month duration proposed at the beginning of the review.

Contact Officer:

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

Consulted:

Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

- 1 - Summary of Representations
- 2 - Representations in detail with officer comments

ITEM 10

- 3 - Proposals to be implemented in Alresford Road, Annandale Road, Duncan Drive, Maori Road, Millmead area (including Bury Fields, Bury Street, Lawn Road and Millmead Terrace), St Omer Road, Sycamore Road, The Oval, Upperton Road and Woodbridge Road, as well as those not to be introduced in Vicarage Gate

Sources/background papers:

- Item 9, Guildford Local Committee, 13 December 2016
 - Item 9, Guildford Local Committee, 22 March 2017
-