

**GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL AND  
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**GUILDFORD JOINT COMMITTEE**

**DATE: 19 September 2018**



**LEAD OFFICER: ANDY HARKIN, PARKING MANAGER, GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**SUBJECT: GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW AND SCOPING REPORT**

**AREA(S) AFFECTED: ALL**

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

As part of the Guildford Parking strategy, a Parking review is conducted every 18 months. This report presents the issues that have been raised to date and recommends the actions and next steps.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Guildford Joint Committee is asked to agree:**

- (i) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's intention to make an order to give effect to proposals at the following locations:
  - a. **Merrow Street** – Merrow Resident Association and residents report that cars parked on both sides because of chicanes and access issues, especially for emergency or large vehicles. When entering Merrow Street from Epsom Road you are immediately on the wrong side of the road. Double yellow lines are too short and need to be extended. Controls are required. (Development plan for Merrow Street in ANNEXE 4).
  - b. **Hareward Road** – Non-residents, mainly construction vehicles from Dial a truck, park on crest of the hill causing drivers to go round bend on wrong side of road and at times meet oncoming traffic. Obstruction of road and visibility causing Hazard. (Development plan for Harewood Road in ANNEXE 5).
  - c. **Stoughton Road** – Stoughton residents experience problems with blocked driveways, especially on drop-off and pick-up times for school. Parking on both sides and close to the junction causes visibility issues and problems turning or passing. Controls are required. (Development plan for Stoughton Road in ANNEXE 6).
  - d. **Stoughton Road** – Stoughton, an existing disabled bay outside Nos. 313/315, is no longer required as resident moved away. Plan to convert bay to free unrestricted parking place. (Development plan for Stoughton Road in ANNEXE 7).

- e. **Artillery Terrace** – Disabled Bay request made. GBC agreed to advisory disabled bay, which will be formalised in next review. (Development plan for Artillery Terrace in ANNEXE 8).

If any representations are received, they will be considered by the Parking Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Local Ward and Divisional Members. If no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made.

The TRO 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 above plans are expected to take no more than 12 months to develop using existing resources and the Parking Manager’s delegated powers.

**(ii) To refer the following items for review by the newly established Parking and Air Quality Working Group:**

- (a) The retrospective exclusion of new residential developments of 6 dwellings or more, in the controlled parking zone areas A, B, C and D, from accessing the permit scheme to ensure demand does not further outstrip supply. See section 2.8 (ii).
- (b) to review the recommendations from the Guildford borough Council Overview & Scrutiny (O&S) Committee in conjunction with comments made in section 6 relating to the additional resources and extended timetable to achieve a positive outcome. The recommendations are as follows and shown at ANNEXE 1).

<b>O&amp;S Committee Recommendations</b>	
A	Parking controls in Area A, B, D and northern section of Area C, be extended to operate 8.30am to 9pm, 7 days a week
B	Free limited waiting shared use bays within Area A, B and the northern section of Area C, be changed to charged dual user bays
C	Pay and display, including RingGo, be extended into the residential areas of the Controlled Parking Zone
D	The possible contribution of RingGo to the costs of extending the pay by phone signage through CPZ be progressed
E	The limit on permits in Area D of the Controlled Parking Zone be increased, in the first instance by 5% <b>(Parking Officers recommend to increase by 10%)</b>
F	On a case by case basis, the less well-used pay and display only bays be converted into dual use, this is to say, made available to permit holders
G	The limit on issuing adjacent permits for Area A be lowered and that Area A adjacent permits no longer be issued in relation to a second car

H	Area A permit holders be allowed to access Area E
I	Saturday parking controls in the norther section of Area J be removed
J	In addition to visitors permit scratch cards, RingGo or a similar pay by phone system be offered as an option for visitors parking ( <b>Parking officer recommend “Virtual payment system” not just RingGo or Pay by phone</b> )
K	To accompany the extended controls into evenings and Sundays, the annual household limit on visitor scratch cards be doubled

Note: items in red above are further recommendations by Parking Officers

- (c) To gain councillor feedback in relation to the CPZ/Non-CPZ parking requests lists to enable the Parking Manager to develop proposals for the “Local” issues shown in ANNEXE 2 & 3. If the proposals are likely to be uncontroversial, the Parking Manager can use delegated powers to progress them, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Local Ward and Divisional Members. If the proposals are expected to generate significant comment, then they will be reported back to the Committee with a view to seeking authority to formally advertise them.

To develop and implement the above items would take 48-60 months with existing resources. Therefore, the Parking and Air Quality Working Group are also asked to consider the scope and resource implications.

#### **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 make local improvements.

#### **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

1.1 During the 2016-2018 review period, the following was agreed by the committee:

- i. that reviews are combined and deal with issues both in the CPZ and Non-CPZ 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 significant 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. increase the level of delegation of Parking Manager/Officer to approve proposals if they are uncontroversial, in conjunction with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Local Ward and Divisional Members. This would reduce the need to return to the Committee where everyone agrees to a proposal, to reduce the number of reports having to be presented to the committee and to expedite the review process.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

**2.1** Requests for parking changes have been collated from three sources:

- i. Requests made directly to the Parking Manager up to July 2018. These are explained in 2.2 and 2.3 below.
- ii. Parking Manager/Officer recommendations as explained in 7(i).
- iii. Recommendations received from the Guildford Borough Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, summarised in 7(ii).

**2.2** The Parking Manager receives requests from residents, business owners, commuters, Parish Councils and others. Some have been closed for a variety of reasons such as being dealt with as part of previous revisions or referred on for resolution outside of parking.

**2.3** There remain **550 requests in total**, broken down as follows:

- i. **CPZ.** There are **207 CPZ** requests, which appear in ANNEXE 2. These have been put in Ward, CPZ zone then Road order, and then summarised into the nature of the request and whether the issue is a “Local” one, or involves “Area-wide” considerations. From the requests there are 108 separate roads, 152 are “Area wide” and 55 are “Local”.
- ii. **Non-CPZ.** There are **343 Non-CPZ** requests, which appear in ANNEXE 3. These have been put in Ward and then Road order and then summarised into the nature of the request and whether the issue is a “Local” one, or involves “Area-wide” considerations. From the requests there are 251 separate roads, 290 are “Area wide”, 52 are “Local” and 1 is classed as part “Area wide” and “Local”.

**2.4 By way of explanation**, ‘Local’ issues involve the possibility of altering of one or two restrictions in a specific location.

ANNEXES 2 & 3 identify individual requests for ‘Local’ changes to the parking scheme. With these localised requests for changes, we would not expect those proposing them to show they had support from other households because they only affect a limited area.

**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.

ANNEXES 2 & 3 identify individual requests for 'Area-wide' changes to the parking scheme. These requests relate to different 'Area-wide' issues in various localities.

'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.

Within the CPZ area, some of these issues may be considered by the scope of the O&S Committee report. However, a number of others are not, although petitions/parking scheme request forms have not been received regarding what could potentially be significant changes.

### **Other Considerations**

**2.6** Requests have also been received which relate to other parking schemes however none have included parking scheme forms or petitions to show clear evidence of the support within that location and so cannot be progressed. These requests are for:

- i. **London Road** – Burpham
- ii. **Mill Lane** - Pirbright
- iii. **Southway** – Westborough
- iv. **Springfield Road** – Holy Trinity
- v. **St Lukes Square** – Holy Trinity
- vi. **Manor Fields** – Seale
- vii. **Ardmore Avenue** – Stoughton

**2.7** Petitions have been received for the following locations. The Committee may wish to consider these alongside the other parking requests received and shown in ANNEXES 2 & 3, (highlighted in *Orange*):

- i. **Madrid Road** – Onslow, remove permit prioritisation within parking bay immediately outside shops to improve accessibility.
- ii. **Wilderness Road** – Onslow, convert unrestricted parking to 4 hours max to resolve concerns about non-resident parking bays in Northern part of road.

### **3. OPTIONS:**

**3.1** The Committee could choose to advertise the recommendations in 7(i) and if so would take an estimated 12 months to implement.

**3.2** The Committee could choose to progress a 50 location review and if so, this would take an estimated 18-24 months to implement. The Committee could choose to take some recommendations forward and substitute others in favour of others deemed priorities, based on the feedback.

- 3.3** The Committee could choose to implement more than the 50 items, taking into consideration that the reviews and implementation may take longer than 18-24 months, unless they were able to find additional funding for further resources to speed up the process.
- 3.4** The Parking and Air Quality Working Group could choose to progress the O&S report. On its own would take 24-36 months. If done alongside 3.3 it would take 48-60 months.
- 3.5** The Committee could choose not to formally advertise and progress the proposals. However, the issues that have been raised, and in many cases confirmed by the informal consultation, would remain unresolved.
- 3.6** After a proposal is advertised, any objections received would be reviewed with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Local Ward and Divisional Members, to agree if the Parking Manager/Officer can use their delegated powers to proceed, or if objections need to be reported back to the Committee and a decision taken whether to implement the proposal, or implement less restrictive proposals. If there were a requirement to increase the amount of restrictions as a result of comments received, the proposals would have to be advertised again.

#### **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1** Discussions will be held with Local Borough and County Councillors, once we have a steer from the Parking and Air Quality Working Group, about the work that can be progressed for development.

#### **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

- 5.1** If the Committee agrees to implement the proposed items in 7(i) and 7(ii) funding will come from the Guildford on-street parking account. 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.
- 5.2** The standard 50 location if taken from ANNEXE 2 & 3 (option 3.2) would take 18-24 months to implement and would be approx. £50,000 using existing resources.
- 5.3** If the O&S items 7(ii) (option 3.4) are approved on its own, based on the scope of work required this is likely to extend the timescales between 24-36 months. Investigation, development and implementation of the O&S report recommendations is estimated to cost up to £700,000.
- 5.4** If 3.4 was pursued at the same time as option 3.2 and the Committee wanted to retain a two-year turnaround, this additional demand would require a further FTE or the services of a consultant to develop proposals, draft legal documents, procure services of contractors, equipment provision and oversee implementation and introduction of amendments.
- 5.5** If all issues highlighted by the O&S report were to be progressed, the number of sign changes for operation hour changes and pay by phone technology would

be significant. This would involve a significant number of sign changes and in some cases post changes. It is likely that RingGo, the current provider for the “pay by phone” technology, would be prepared to fund some of the associated signage. If not, then the cost to change all signage would increase accordingly.

**6. WIDER 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.
Human Resource/Training and Development	Set out below.

**Sustainability implications**

- 6.1** 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.
- 6.2** 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 vehicles utilise relatively narrow roads.

**Human Resource Implications**

- 6.3** Whilst pay and display is more efficient to enforce than limited waiting, the outcome of the O&S report would involve regular on-street enforcement over an extended period, to include evenings and Sundays across much of the town centre CPZ. The extended operation hours would equate to more than a 50% increase in on-street enforcement.
- 6.4** Early analysis shows that to implement the O&S report will require 1 additional supervisor and 6-8 additional CEOs. The extended hours would impact on enforcement officers and their worktime patterns. This needs to be discussed with staff and their representatives.
- 6.5** This will also impact on the administration and processing for penalty charge notices (PCN) and permits due to anticipated increases in volumes.
- 6.6** The operation of extended enforcement hours is expected to be self-financing.

## **7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

### **7.1 The Guildford Joint Committee is asked to agree:**

- (i) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's intention to make an order to give effect to the proposals for the following locations;

Planned for developed proposals in ANNEXES noted below

- a. Merrow Street** – Merrow Resident Association and residents report that cars parked on both sides because of chicanes and access issues, especially for emergency or large vehicles. When entering Merrow Street from Epsom Road you are immediately on the wrong side of the road. Double yellow lines are too short and need to be extended. Controls are required. (Development plan for Merrow Street in ANNEXE 4).
- b. Hareward Road** – Non-residents, mainly construction vehicles from Dial a truck, park on crest of the hill causing drivers to go round bend on wrong side of road and at times meet oncoming traffic. Obstruction of road and visibility causing Hazard. (Development plan for Harewood Road in ANNEXE 5).
- c. Stoughton Road** – Stoughton residents experience problems with blocked driveways, especially on drop-off and pick-up times for school. Parking on both sides and close to the junction causes visibility issues and problems turning or passing. Controls are required. (Development plan for Stoughton Road in ANNEXE 6).
- d. Stoughton Road** – Stoughton, an existing disabled bay outside Nos. 313/315, is no longer required as resident moved away. Plan to convert bay to free unrestricted parking place. (Development plan for Stoughton Road in ANNEXE 7).
- e. Artillery Terrace** – Disabled Bay request made. GBC agreed to advisory disabled bay, which will be formalised in next review. (Development plan for Artillery Terrace in ANNEXE 8).

If any representations are received, they will be considered by the Parking Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Local Ward and Divisional Members. If no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made.

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 above are planned to take no more than 12 months to develop. 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. This would involve using existing resources and the Parking Manager's delegated powers to develop proposals and consider representations, therefore providing a quicker turnaround.

**(ii) To refer the following items for review by the newly established Parking and Air Quality Working Group:**

- (a) retrospective exclusion of new residential developments of 6 dwellings or more, in the controlled parking zone areas A, B, C and D. from accessing the permit scheme to ensure demand does not further outstrip supply. See section 2.8 (ii).
- (b) to review the recommendations from the Overview & Scrutiny (O&S) Committee in conjunction with comments in section 6 related to the additional resources and extended timetable to achieve a positive outcome – (see below and ANNEXE 1).

<b>O&amp;S Committee Recommendations</b>	
A	Parking controls in Area A, B, D and northern section of Area C, be extended to operate 8.30am to 9pm, 7 days a week
B	Free limited waiting shared use bays within Area A, B and the northern section of Area C, be changed to charged dual user bays
C	Pay and display, including RingGo, be extended into the residential areas of the Controlled Parking Zone
D	The possible contribution of RingGo to the costs of extending the pay by phone signage through CPZ be progressed
E	The limit on permits in Area D of the Controlled Parking Zone be increased, in the first instance by 5% <b>(Parking Officers recommend to increase by 10%)</b>
F	On a case by case basis, the less well-used pay and display only bays be converted into dual use, this is to say, made available to permit holders
G	The limit on issuing adjacent permits for Area A be lowered and that Area A adjacent permits no longer be issued in relation to a second car
H	Area A permit holders be allowed to access Area E
I	Saturday parking controls in the norther section of Area J be removed
J	In addition to visitors permit scratch cards, RingGo or a similar pay by phone system be offered as an option for visitors parking <b>(Parking officer recommend “Virtual payment system” not just RingGo or Pay by phone)</b>
K	To accompany the extended controls into evenings and Sundays, the annual household limit on visitor scratch cards be doubled

Note: items in red above are further recommendations by Parking officers

- (c) Gain councillor feedback in relation to the CPZ/Non-CPZ parking requests lists to enable the Parking Manager/Officer to develop proposals for the “Local” issues shown in ANNEXE 2 & 3. If the proposals are likely to be uncontroversial, the Parking Manager can use delegated powers to progress them, in consultation with the Chairman, [www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford)

Vice Chairman and relevant Local Ward and Divisional Members. If the proposals are expected to generate significant comment, then they will be reported back to the Committee with a view to seeking authority to formally advertise them.

The scope of the above items to develop and implement would take 48-60 months with existing resources. Therefore, the Parking and Air Quality Working Group are asked to consider the scope and resource implications.

## **8. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

**8.1** If the Committee agrees to advertise the proposals set out in recommendations 7(i), it is likely that this will take place within 12 months. 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 county councillors and the Parking Manager will consult with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Local Ward and Divisional Members of the Committee prior to proceeding.

**8.2** In respect of items (ii) in section 7 further consideration by the Parking and Air Quality Working Group is required, to provide a steer on requirements due to the resource and timescale implications, explained in this report. Once agreed, discussion will be held with relevant Local Borough and County Councillors and where appropriate, proposals developed, with a view to reporting these back to the Committee meeting, seeking authority to formally advertise them.

### **Contact Officer:**

Andrew Harkin, Parking Manager, Guildford Borough Council  
(01483) 444535

### **Consulted:**

Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

### **Annexes:**

- 1 - Proposals from Overview & Scrutiny Committee *(for review by the Parking & Air Quality Working Group)*
- 2 - List of parking change requests received –CPZ *(for review by the Parking & Air Quality Working Group)*
- 3 - List of parking change requests received – Non CPZ *(for review by the Parking & Air Quality Working Group)*
- 4 - Merrow Street development plan
- 5 - Harewood Road development plan
- 6 - Stoughton Road development plan – revision to existing plan
- 7 - Stoughton Road development plan -conversion of disabled bay
- 8 - Artillery Terrace development plan

### **Background papers:**

none