

**GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL AND  
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**



**GUILDFORD  
BOROUGH**

**GUILDFORD JOINT COMMITTEE**

**DATE: 17 MARCH 2021**

**LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW HARKIN, PARKING MANAGER, GUILDFORD BC**

**SUBJECT: PARKING & AIR QUALITY WORKING GROUP – PARKING  
REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT**

**DIVISION: ALL**

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

As part of the Guildford Parking strategy, a Parking review is conducted every 18 months. This report presents the recommended scope of the review as outlined by the Parking & Air Quality Working Group (P&AQWG) and recommends the actions and next steps.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- (i) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's (SCC's) intention to make an order for the proposals developed in respect to shown in **ANNEXE 1** (8 locations)
- (ii) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's (SCC's) intention to make an order for the proposals prioritised by the P&AQWG and shown in **ANNEXE 2**, which include locations from the List of Requests that score 20 points or above (35 locations).
- (iii) that in respect to recommendations (i) and (ii), if no representations are received, the proposed controls be introduced, or if representations are received that these will be considered by the Parking Manager, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair, and respective ward and divisional members, and the way forward determined.
- (iv) in respect to the List of Requests shown in **ANNEXE 3**, remove all requests that score 5 points or less (66 locations), or which score between 6-10 and have remained on the list for more than 5 years without being progressed (potentially up to 114 locations).
- (v) to an appraisal by officers of the methodology associated with parking reviews in preparation for the next review with a view to improving the transparency of the process.

## REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To:

- (i) assist with safety, access and traffic movement,
- (ii) increase the availability of parking space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities,
- (iii) make local parking improvements.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The implementation of the first part of the previous parking review was completed in February 2021, and the remaining part, involving the extension of the operational hours of central areas of the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ), is due to be implemented in August / September 2021.
- 1.2 At the November 2020 meeting of the GJC, it agreed for proposals to be developed to deal with issues in a number of 'quick win' locations. These were:
  - Agraria Road, CPZ
  - Bowers Lane, Burpham
  - Chester Close, Ash
  - Cunningham Avenue / Boxgrove Park, Merrow
  - Mountside, CPZ
  - Manor Road, Stoughton
  - South Hill, CPZ
  - Shawfield Primary School, Ash
- 1.3 In addition to these 'quick win' sites, the proposals for which are shown in **ANNEXE 1**, there are a large number of other locations, where requests have been received from individual residents, groups of residents, businesses, and their elected representatives. Around 200 of these are within the CPZ whilst over 300 involve locations elsewhere throughout the borough.
- 1.4 Although reviews now consider issues in both CPZ and non-CPZ together, both the 2016-18 and 2018-20 reviews primarily concentrated on issues within the CPZ. Indeed, when completed, the most recent review will have addressed around 60 issues within the CPZ, and a further 17 issues in non-CPZ location.
- 1.5 Therefore, the P&AQWG recommend that the current review primarily focuses on non-CPZ locations. This report outlines the assessment that has been undertaken to prioritise these non-CPZ locations, recommends that a threshold score of 20 or above is adopted, and as a consequence, that the proposals shown in **ANNEXE 2** are progressed to advertisement.
- 1.6 In addition to this it is recommended that two requests from the CPZ are progressed: Park Road and a Elmside. This is to allow for loading for shops and to support a Vehicle Cross Over Application.

- 1.7 The number of issues on the List of Requests has grown considerably over the years. Often, some of the requests have little or no chance of ever being progressed due to the nature of the issue and their respective priorities.
- 1.8 Triaging the List of Requests, as recommended, and removing lower scoring (less than or equal to 5) issues and those that are more than five years old scoring 6-10, will ensure that the list of request remains at a manageable size and the Committee can focus on the items that are most likely to come to fruition and have greatest impact. See **ANNEXE 3**.
- 1.9 The review methodology was last considered by the Committee at the start of the 2016-18 review. This resulted in various changes including amendments to the Borough Council's website which provides the public with more detail about how to make a request and how their request will be considered. Additionally, a form was developed to allow those wanting significant changes to the parking controls to consult with their neighbours. However, concerns have been raised amongst some councillors that the review process is still not sufficiently transparent.
- 1.10 It is recommended that during the course of the present review further consideration is given in to the ways that the information relating to how the review process is undertaken is conveyed to both the public, councillors and other interested parties.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

- 2.1 There are currently **365** requests for controls in non-CPZ locations and a further **221** requests for controls in the Guildford town centre CPZ.
- 2.2 In previous parking reviews, which have previously concentrated on issues within the CPZ, threshold scores of 24 and 25 and above have been used.
- 2.3 If a similar score were used for the present review, this would result in only 15 being progressed. This number is somewhat lower than the 50-location review the Committee has previously identified as being the optimum.
- 2.4 If a significantly lower threshold score from the one recommended by P&AQWG was chosen, this could result in substantially more locations being considered, with the obvious consequences for the duration of the review. Please note that due to the statutory, procurement and implementation processes involved, dealing with significantly fewer locations would not result in a proportionate reduction in the length of the review. Dealing with a single request in isolation would still take 6-9 months to progress to implementation.
- 2.5 Therefore the P&AQWG recommends that a score 20 points or above is used as the threshold for assessing and progressing requests in non-CPZ locations. This would results in 35 requests being progressed.
- 2.6 The requests that have been raised that meet the threshold fall into three main categories:
  - Safety and access
  - Availability of space for a particular user group
  - Environmental reasons

2.7 Those locations that have been raised for safety and access reasons include:

- Ash Hill Road, Ash (2 locations)
- Ash Street, Ash
- Avenue De Cagny area, Pirbright (various roads around the village green)
- Broad Street, Westborough
- Frimley Road, Ash Vale
- High Street, Puttenham
- London Road, Burpham
- Lower Road, Effingham
- New Road, Chilworth (2 locations)
- Ockham Road South, East Horsley
- Oxenden Road, Ash
- Prospect Road, Ash Vale
- Regalfield Close, Stoughton
- Shepherd's Hill Road, Westborough
- The Cardinals, Tongham
- The Street, Puttenham
- The Street, West Clandon
- Worplesdon Road, Stoughton

2.8 Those locations that have been raised for availability of space reasons include:

- Elstead Road, Seale
- Shawfield Road, Ash
- Station Road West, Ash Vale
- Stoughton Road, Stoughton / Bellfields
- Vale Road, Ash

2.9 When requests for prioritisation measures, such as residents' parking, are received, if the person requesting the measures has not demonstrated wider support as part of their submission, as a matter of course, they are sent a petition form that allows them to gather further support. However, of the above locations, in only Elstead Road has the resident requesting consideration of a residents' parking scheme provided any evidence to suggest widespread support for such measures. Notwithstanding, the locations still exceeds the threshold level. Therefore, in all the other locations, only more limited proposals have been developed, essentially to ensure that the parking that does take place does not cause safety or access issues. Stoughton Road and Frimley Road already have significant restrictions therefore no proposals have been proposed.

2.10 Those locations that are related to vehicle crossover / disabled bay requests

- Elmside, CPZ (vehicle crossover)
- Manor Road, Stoughton (disabled bay)
- Mountside, Guildford (vehicle crossover - previously agreed 'quick win')

- 2.11 Those locations that have been raised for environmental reasons include
- Ash Hill Road, Ash
  - Broad Street, Westborough
  - Guildford Road, East Horsley
  - Station Road, Gomshall
- 2.12 A number of the above requests relate to a desire for issues associated with pavement and verge parking to be resolved. Whilst the introduction of formalised controls within the carriageway allows adjacent highway verge areas and footways to be enforced, it is not the norm for such measures to be introduced specifically to deal with footway and verge parking issues, unless there are wider highway safety and access considerations. Furthermore, physical measures, which would ordinarily be considered by SCC, are often more effective at dealing with the issue.
- 2.13 Furthermore, the Government has recently published a consultation document seeking views on the subject, with a view to amending national legislation. Therefore, in the case of those requests relating to footway and verge parking, where appropriate, only more limited proposals have been developed, essentially to ensure that footway parking is prevented around junctions and bends, where it would have obvious safety or access implications.
- 2.14 There have been a small number of requests which it was not considered appropriate to progress at this time.
- Station Road West, Ash Vale - a request to reduce the level of restriction near a school. The restrictions near schools are implemented for safety reasons and therefore it is not considered appropriate to remove the restrictions. Furthermore, most previous requests in this location have expressed a desire for more extensive controls to be introduced.
  - Ockham Road South, East Horsley - not possible to be progressed because the area where restrictions have been requested is unmade, and at the very least would require resurfacing.
  - Lower Road, Effingham - refers to the issues pre-empted by the expansion of the Howard Effingham School. Officers are liaising with Surrey County Council Transport Development Planning about these, so it is not necessary to develop proposals at this time.
  - Ash Hill Road, Ash (roundabout junction with Guildford Road) - are to form part of Ash Bridge works, so as to reflect revisions to highway layout.

### **Triaging of Request Lists**

- 2.15 Over many years, numerous requests for new and amended parking controls have been received. When the Committee last considered the review methodology it decided, amongst other things, that each review should broadly be limited in scope to resolving issues in around 50 locations. This number ensures that each review is of a manageable size and can be conducted in a timely fashion. However, the number of new requests received often exceeds the number that are dealt with within each review cycle, and over time this has led to both the non-CPZ and CPZ lists of requests increasing in size.

- 2.16 Whilst many requests are received, a fair proportion of these are never realistically going to be progressed. This is due to a number of factors including the nature of the issue raised and its implications for highway safety and access, and the emergence of newer, higher scoring requests.
- 2.17 Despite the above, these locations have always been added to the list of requests. However, the presence of the lower scoring issues on the list only serves to deflect focus. To some extent, having them on the list also gives the person making the request false hope that it may be progressed, when in reality it is highly unlikely, unless circumstances change significantly.
- 2.18 Therefore it is recommended that all requests that score 5 points or fewer (66 locations), or which score between 6 and 10 and have remained on the list for more than five years without being progressed (potentially up to 114 locations), are removed. This action would effectively halve the length of the non-CPZ list of requests.
- 2.19 In respect to the list of CPZ requests, as these locations are not scored in the same way as non-CPZ requests, it is suggested that they are removed from the list after five years, on the basis that they have failed to be progressed during at least two reviews.
- 2.20 Of course, if circumstances change that are likely to change a particular request's score, members of the public and councillors will have the opportunity to raise the issue again, and for the matter to be reassessed and potentially added back on the list.

### **Review Methodology**

- 2.21 The review methodology was last considered by the Committee at the beginning of the 2016-18 review. This resulted in the reviews becoming more limited in scope, being subject to increased delegation, and in line with Surrey County Council's policy, greater emphasis being placed on residents and their representatives to provide evidence that a particular course of action had high levels of support, prior to the Committee instructing officers to investigate the matter further within a review.
- 2.22 These measures were designed to make reviews more agile, shorter in duration, and to ensure that officers did not spend significant amounts of non-productive time developing and consulting upon proposals which ultimately did not come to fruition.
- 2.23 The review also resulted in changes being made to the Borough Council's website, which now provides the public with more detail about how to make a request and how their request will be considered. Additionally, a form was developed to allow those wanting significant changes to the parking controls to consult with their neighbours. However, concerns have been raised amongst some councillors that the review process is still not sufficiently transparent.
- 2.24 It is recommended that, during the course of the present review, further consideration is given in to the ways that the information relating to how the review process is undertaken is conveyed to both the public, councillors and other interested parties. Measures to be considered could include (but are not limited to):

- Further improvements to the information provided on the website, the review process, timescales and how requests are considered.
- Forwarding individual requests for controls to all relevant Ward and Divisional Councillors at the time the request is received.
- Conducting desktop assessments on a piecemeal basis at the time the request is received.
- Publication of a live list of requests and assessment scores

2.25 Although there is the potential for greater inconsistency by undertaking assessments on a piecemeal basis, rather than in one tranche, the initial assessment would provide officers with an indication of whether an issue could possibly be progressed during a future review. Further checks can be undertaken at the time of the review to ensure that the initial assessment was correct.

2.26 Furthermore, previously, those submitting requests that are likely to be lower scoring have not been given an indication that it is unlikely that their request will be progressed. Undertaking a quick assessment at the time the request is received will make it possible for the member of the public to learn that their issue will or will not be added to the List of Requests for further consideration. Of course, this does mean that officers, in consultation with the relevant Ward and Division Councillors, will ultimately determine whether an issue will or will not be considered further, rather than the Committee.

### **3. OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 The Committee could choose to advertise recommendation (i) and (ii), and if so, it would take an estimated 12 months to implement the controls.
- 3.2 The Committee could choose to progress and implement controls in more locations than those identified in **ANNEXES 1 and 2**, but these proposals would have to be developed, further Committee authority sought to advertise, be advertised and representations considered. This could extend the review by around six months.
- 3.3 The Committee could choose not to formally advertise and progress the proposals. However, the issues that have been raised would remain unresolved.

### **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 The List of Requests shown in **ANNEXE 3** have been circulated to all borough and county councillors, and their feedback has been used to finalise the assessment scores, and each location's respective priority.
- 4.2 If recommendations (i) and (ii) are agreed, the developed proposals shown in **ANNEXES 1 and 2** will be advertised and the public and statutory consultees invited to make formal representations.

**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 £12,000. 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, dual-use, shared-use and 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

**8.1 Sustainability implications**

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.

## **9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

9.1 Officers recommend that the Committee agrees:

- (i) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's (SCC's) intention to make an order for the proposals developed in respect to shown in **ANNEXE 1** (8 locations)
- (ii) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's (SCC's) intention to make an order for the proposals prioritised by the P&AQWG and shown in **ANNEXE 2**, which include locations from the List of Requests that score 20 points or above (35 locations)
- (iii) that in respect to recommendations (i) and (ii), if 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 and the proposed controls introduced.
- (iv) in respect to the List of Requests shown in **ANNEXE 3**, remove all requests that score 5 points or less (66 locations), or which score between 6-10 and have remained on the list for more than 5 years without being progressed (potentially up to 114 locations).
- (v) to an appraisal by officers of the methodology associated with parking reviews in preparation for the next review with a view to improving the transparency of the process.

## **10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to advertise the proposals shown in **ANNEXES 1 and 2** this process will take place in the coming months, and, if subsequently agreed, implementation would be expected within around 12 months.
- 10.2 The advertisement process would involve publishing various public notices, erecting street notices, placing documentation on deposit, publishing them online, and writing directly to those in the immediate vicinity of each of the proposals.
- 10.3 The Parking Manager will consult with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Ward and Divisional Members regarding any representations made.

---

### **Contact Officer:**

Lisa Haydney, On-Street Parking Co-ordinator, Guildford Borough Council  
email: [lisa.haydney@guildford.gov.uk](mailto:lisa.haydney@guildford.gov.uk) tel. no.: 01483 444559

**Consulted:**

All local ward and divisional councillors

**Annexes:**

Annexe 1 – ‘Quick win proposals’ developed and recommended to be advertised

Annexe 2 – Other proposals developed and recommended to be advertised

Annexe 3 – List of Requests highlighting those recommended to be removed from the list

**Sources/background papers:**

- Item 9, Guildford Local Committee, 13 December 2016 (minute 186/16)
  - Item 8, Guildford Joint Committee, 18 November 2020 (minute 25/20)
-