

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL AND
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL



GUILDFORD
BOROUGH

GUILDFORD JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 1st JULY 2020

LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW HARKIN, PARKING MANAGER, GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

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

AREA(S) AFFECTED: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report presents the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals for new or changed parking restrictions across the borough.

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 Guildford Joint Committee is asked to agree that:

Town centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

- (i) having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, the proposals for the north part of Area C are not progressed.
- (ii) having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement the amended controls as originally advertised, including an extension to the operational hours of the parking bays and single yellow lines in Areas A, B and D to Monday to Sunday 8.30am to 9pm.
- (iii) if (ii) is agreed, implementation takes place as and when parking behaviours return to a more normal state following the COVID 19 pandemic. If the order is to be made, this must be done within 2 years of the start of the original public consultation (20 September 2019). The need to introduce the proposals and implementation date to be determined by the Parking Manager in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and 2 delegate members.

Other Locations

- (iv) 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 and amended parking controls to the existing as shown in ANNEXE 1.

- (v) having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, those in 2.16 are not progressed at this 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 19th September 2018, the Committee agreed that following the OSC report on the issues in the CPZ proposals to improve this should be included in the next review process.
- 1.2 The March 2019 committee agreed to advertise the following proposals:
- Parking controls in Area A, B, D and north part of Area C, be extended to operate 8.30am to 9pm, 7 days a week,
 - The limit on permits in Area D of the Controlled Parking Zone be increased, in the first instance by 10% (from 278 to 316 permits),
 - the annual household limit on visitor scratch cards be doubled (from 30 to 60 per annum),
 - the retrospective exclusion of new residential developments of 6 dwellings or more, in the CPZ areas A, B and D,
 - formalisation of a disabled bay in Artillery Terrace.
- 1.3 In addition to the CPZ changes the GJC also agree to advertise a further 17 locations.
- Aldershot Road, Boxgrove Avenue, Harewood Road, Harpers Road, Hazel Avenue, King's Road (Shalford), Manor Road, Merrow Street, Newark Lane, New Road (Chilworth), Roundhill Way, Shere Lane, Stoughton Road, Stratford Road, The Street (Tongham) The Street (West Horsley), Worplesdon Road.
- 1.4 All of the proposals were advertised on the 20th September with the exception of the retrospective exclusion of new residential developments of 6 dwellings or more, in the Controlled Parking Zone Areas A, B and D, which requires further legal consultation.
- 1.5 Following the December meeting of the P&AQWG it was decided any proposals which received minimal objection should be progressed at the December meeting. The following locations were brought to the committee and agreed to be implemented:
- Aldershot Road, Guildford Road (Ash), New Road (Chilworth), and disabled Bays in Artillery Terrace, Matryr Road & Roundhill Way

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The formal advertisement of proposals took place between 20th September and 11th October 2019. The proposals encompassed areas A, B, D and north of C of the Controlled Parking Zone as well as 17 other locations.
- 2.2 We wrote directly to 9,931 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 Council's 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 Most of the representations were submitted online and most of the proposals received representations. Indeed, only those in Worplesdon Road, Artillery Terrace and Roundhill Way did not.
- Aldershot Road (4 representations) *agreed at Dec 2019 GJC*
 - Boxgrove Avenue (20 representations)
 - CPZ, Guildford (424 representations)
 - Guildford Road / Harpers Road, Ash (3 representations) *agreed at Dec 2019 GJC*
 - Harewood Road / Kingfisher Drive (61 representations)
 - Hazel Avenue / Larch Avenue (4 representations)
 - Kings Road, Shalford (118 representations)
 - Manor Road, Tongham (6 representations)
 - Merrow Street (32 representations)
 - Merrow Allotments Car Park (11 representations)
 - Newark Lane, Ripley (4 representations)
 - New Road, Chilworth (2 representations)
 - Shere Lane, Shere (25 representations)
 - Stoughton Road (145 representations)
 - Stoughton Road Disabled Bay (1 representation)
 - Stratford Road (56 representations)
 - The Street, Tongham (13 representations + 104-signature petition)
 - The Street, West Horsley (47 representations)
 - Worplesdon Road (0 representations)
- 2.4 A table summarising the representations appears in ANNEXE 2. To help gain an overall impression of the feedback we have analysed the comments. Therefore, ANNEXE 2 also details our view of whether the comments were supportive or opposed to the proposals. We have also categorised those
- www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford

comments generally supportive and generally opposed, and where changes were suggested. This analysis is presented to provide a general impression of the feedback received, but it is important that each representation is considered.

- 2.5 Due to the number of responses received across all the locations, the full report with officers' comments will be available on the council's website.

CPZ, Areas A, B, D and North part of C (increase prioritisation of space for permit holders through and extending the operational hours of the controls to include evenings and Sundays)

- 2.6 As well as the forms of advertisement mentioned in 2.2 we wrote directly to 7,932 addresses in the relevant areas of the CPZ. This comprises of 2,478 in Area A, 1,199 in Area B, 195 in area C and 3,520 in D. Overall we received 424 responses which equates to a response rate of about 6%.

Area A

- We received 149 representations which referred to catchment A. This equates to 6% of those written to directly. There were 28 comments stating support for the proposals, 15 offering general support, 5 generally opposed and 99 stated opposition. 2 representations did not seem to express either support or opposition.
- Of the 15 that were generally supportive, 5 wanted more restrictive controls, whilst 10 wanted less restrictive controls. Of the 5 generally opposed, all wanted less restrictive controls. 3 representations did not seem to express either support or opposition.
- In respect to evening controls there was some support (28) whilst the majority opposed (85). However, regarding Sunday controls there was less supportive representations (22) and more opposed (76).
- Although the majority of those that responded opposed the extension of the controls into the evening and Sunday, and the operation of the single yellow lines over the extended periods, this opposition equates to only 2% of those consulted with directly.

Area B

- We received 26 representations which referred to catchment B. This equates to 4% of those written to directly. There were 10 comments stating support for the proposals, 2 generally opposed and 14 stated opposition.
- Of the 2 generally opposed, all wanted less restrictive controls.
- In respect to evening controls there was some support (11) whilst the majority opposed (22). In terms of Sunday controls there was some support (10) and the majority opposed (22).
- Although the majority of those that responded opposed the extension of the controls into the evening and Sunday, and the operation of the single yellow lines over the extended periods, this opposition equates to less than 1% of those consulted with directly.

Area C

- We received 71 representations which referred to catchment C. This equates to 37% of those written to directly. There were 4 comments stating support for the proposals, 1 offering general support, 2 generally opposed and 64 stated opposition.
- Of the 1 representation which was generally supportive, all wanted more restrictive controls. Of the 2 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 and evening classes.
- In respect to evening controls there was little support (3) and most opposed (49). Again, Sunday controls there was little support (3) and more opposed (54).
- There was a significant level of response, and a degree of opposition expressed.

Area D

- We received 84 representations which referred to catchment D. This equates to 2% of those written to directly. There were 7 comments stating support for the proposals, 9 offering general support, 4 generally opposed and 59 stated opposition. 5 representations did not seem to express either support or opposition.
- Of the 9 that were generally supportive, 3 wanted more restrictive controls, whilst 6 wanted less restrictive controls. Of the 4 generally opposed, 3 wanted more restrictive controls, whilst 1 wanted less restrictive controls.
- In respect to evening controls there was some support (12) and little opposition (1). Again, Sunday controls there was little support (11) and more opposed (50).
- Although the majority of those that responded opposed the extension of the controls into the evening and Sunday, and the operation of the single yellow lines over the extended periods, this opposition equates to only 1% of those consulted with directly.

Undefined

- We received 73 representations which did not refer to a specific catchment. There were 7 comments stating support for the proposals, 4 offering general support, 2 generally opposed and 57 stated opposition. 3 representations did not seem to express either support or opposition.
- Of the that were generally supportive, all wanted less restrictive controls. Of the 2 generally opposed, all wanted less restrictive controls.
- In respect to evening controls there was little support (6) and some opposition (50). Again, Sunday controls there was little support (6) and more opposition (44).
- Although the majority of those that responded opposed the extension of the controls into the evening and Sunday, and the operation of the single yellow lines over the extended periods, this opposition equates to less than 1% of those consulted with directly.

- 2.7 The feedback was also broken down into themes in order to understand the qualitative feedback better. This included those that expressed wishes to greater eligibility to residents permits; To encourage visitors, Better enforcement, To discourage visitors, Fewer permits issued, More permit only, Restrictions on new developments, Visitors permits cost reduced, Allow permits in car parks, Prioritise permit holders, Accessing Christ Church.
- 2.8 One of the most common themes was a desire to support the town. This was most popular in undefined group (24) and D (21) followed by A (12), C (6) and B (3). Overall this equates to 13% of the representations.
- 2.9 Another strong theme was Christ Church which was specific only to catchment C. There were 58 representations which mentioned the restrictions would affect their ability to attend services there and some representations mentioned fears that the private car park would be abused by the public who could no longer park on the street. Whilst it is not possible to ascertain exactly how many were from residents, it appears many of the responses were from visitors.
- 2.10 Another common theme was visitors, with most representations expressing the wish to encourage visitors: A (19) B (10), C (12), D (18) and (9) undefined. However, there were a number of representations wishing to discourage visitors as residents felt this created more competition for space.

Feedback

- 2.11 Whilst there were more representations opposed to the proposals, there was a significantly low response rate in Areas A, B and D. The north part of Area C had a significantly higher response rate at 34%.
- 2.12 The representations were distributed to local borough and county councillors. A feedback session was held on 4th February where the results from the CPZ was discussed.
- 2.13 Based on the high response rate from catchment C it is recommended it is excluded from the proposals. Some opportunities were identified to amend the controls further based on the feedback of the representation; however, it should be noted these would require a re-advertisement of the proposals.
- 2.14 Therefore, recommendation for the CPZ is to implement as advertised with the exclusion of Area C. However, should the committee wish to further compromise the following could be amended.
- Area D – extend the limited waiting in some parking bays from a max of 30 minutes stay to a period of up to 1 hour to make it attractive from visitors to stop for longer in the Upper High Street.
 - Area B – that the proposed restrictions could be relaxed to exclude Sunday controls on resident bays and yellow lines.
 - Area A – that the proposed restrictions could be relaxed to exclude Sunday controls on resident bays and yellow lines.
- 2.15 The re-advertisement of the proposals would take 3-6 months to arrange, analyse and distribute the feedback to local members, due to the size of the consultations involved.

Other locations

2.16 The following locations received significant feedback expressing concerns for the proposals and therefore are recommended not to be progressed at this present time.

- King's Road, Shalford (118 representations)
- The Street, Tongham (13 representations, subsequent 104-signature petition)
- The Street, West Horsley (47 representations)

In the case of The Street, Tongham, although a low level of representation was received during the formal consultation period, the petition presented to the Committee in March suggested a high level of opposition to the proposals. Therefore, it is recommended that this proposal is not progressed.

2.17 After considering the feedback the following locations are recommended to be progressed without any amendments:

- Guildford Road/Harpers Road (3 representations)
- Hazel Avenue (4 representations)
- Manor Road (6 representations)
- Merrow Allotments (11 representations)
- New Road, Chilworth (2 representations)
- Newark Lane (4 Representations)
- Stoughton Road Disabled Bay (1 representation)

2.19 After consideration of the feedback, it is felt that the following proposals can be amended to further to balance the needs of various user groups, without impacting the overall integrity of the design. Therefore, it is recommended that the following is implemented with these minor amendments:

- Boxgrove Avenue (20 Representations)
Implement all except the Double Yellow Lines on the outside area of the 90-degree 'elbow' in Boxgrove Avenue
- Harewood Road/Kingfisher Drive (61 Representations)
Reduce extent of Double Yellow Line by 5m each side around the entrance to Jason's drive, Speedwell Close and the North side of the entrance to Ashbury Crescent. All other restrictions are implemented.
- Merrow Street (32 Representations)
Implement all except the extent of Double Yellow Line opposite entrance to Merrow Place
- Stoughton Road (145 Representations)
Amend the proposals to exclude Badger and Heron Close except for the extension to the junction protection with Stoughton Road)
- Shere (25 Representations)
Reduce extent of Double Yellow Lines on the south side of Lower Street from 15m to 10m

- Stratford Road / Oak Tree Close (15 Representations)
Implement Single Yellow Line restriction only

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.
- 3.2 Based on the high response rate from catchment C, it is recommended it is excluded from the proposals. Some opportunities were identified to possibly amend the controls further, based on the feedback of the consultation. However, it should be noted these would require a re-advertisement of the proposals. This could take 3-6 months to complete, and may also impact the implementation of the other elements of the review agreed.
- Area D – extend the limited waiting in some parking bays from a max of 30 minutes stay to a period of up to 1 hour to make it attractive from visitors to stop for longer in the Upper High Street.
 - Area B – that the proposed restrictions could be relaxed to exclude Sunday controls on resident bays and yellow lines.
 - Area A – that the proposed restrictions could be relaxed to exclude Sunday controls on resident bays and yellow lines.
- 3.3 The representations and controls recommended for implementation have been distributed to local borough and county councillors.
- 3.4 If the Committee agrees the recommendations, it is likely that the implementation of the measures in recommendation (iv) will take place over the summer of 2020. As highlighted in recommendation (iii), the measures in recommendation (ii) will be implemented when it is considered appropriate to do so, in light of the impact of the COVID 19 pandemic on parking behaviours.
- 3.5 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 almost 10,000 addresses and notices put up in the roads affected. There have been around 3,890 '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 ANNEXE 2 have been circulated to relevant local borough and county councillors.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 To create the orders, publicise the amendments and implement the changes to the signs and lines required to give effect to the proposals we estimate it will cost no more than £70,000. If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals, the money will come from the Guildford on-street parking account.

6. WIDER 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.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications
Equality and Diversity	No significant implications
Localism (including community involvement and impact)	Set out below.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications
Public Health	No significant implications
Human Resource/Training and Development	No significant implications

7.1 Localism

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.

7.2 Sustainability

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.

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.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 7.1 We recommend the Committee agrees:

www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford

- (i) That, based on the feedback from the public consultation, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement the proposed changes to the CPZ, with the exception of the proposed changes to the north part of Area C, but as outlined in recommendation (iii), mindful of the impact of the COVID 19 pandemic on the possible need for / timing of the implementation.
- (ii) 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 1, but that the proposals in 2.16 are not progressed at the present time.

8. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 8.1 If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals set out in recommendation (iv), it is likely that this will take place in summer 2020.
- 8.2 If the Committee agrees to implement the proposals set out in recommendation (ii) and (iii) it is likely that this will take place before autumn 2021.
- 8.3 The next review cycle is due to run consecutively with the implementation of the current review. Even if the implementation phases of the present review are split between this and next summer, it will be possible for work to begin on the next review, albeit that progress may be impacted during the implementation of the second phase of the present review.
- 8.4 Should the committee decide to amend the proposals further, as set out in 3.2, a re-advertisement would be required. The preparation for this, alongside the statutory consultation period of 3 weeks, the analysis and circulation of feedback to local members and the implementation of the other proposals the Committee have been asked to agree, would be estimated to take at least 3-6 months, and possibly longer, given the current restrictions placed upon advertising proposals due to the COVID 19 pandemic.

Contact Officer:

Lisa Haydney, On-Street Parking Co-ordinator, Guildford Borough Council
(tel. 01483 505050)

Consulted:

Local Ward and Divisional Councillors

Annexes:

- 1 - Proposals to be implemented
- 2 - Summary of Representations

Background papers:

- Item 10, Guildford Joint Committee, 20 March 2019
- Item 11, Guildford Joint Committee, 19 September 2018
- Review of On-Street Parking, Guildford Overview & Scrutiny, June 2018

www.surreycc.gov.uk/guildford

- Representations in detail with officer comments

This page is intentionally left blank