

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

DATE: WEDNESDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2013
 LEAD OFFICER: DAVID CURL, PARKING STRATEGY & IMPLEMENTATION
 TEAM MANAGER



SUBJECT: REVIEW OF PARKING CONTROLS – ONSLOW VILLAGE,
 OTHER AREAS OF THE TOWN CENTRE & CHILWORTH

DIVISION: GUILDFORD SOUTH WEST
 GUILDFORD SOUTH EAST
 THERE

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

To provide proposals with a view to addressing parking issues in the part of Onslow Village that is not in the town centre Controlled Parking zone (CPZ). The Committee agreed to consult on a proposal to extend the CPZ and this report presents the comments received as a result of the exhibitions and makes recommendations as to the next steps.

A number of other parking issues have also arisen in areas around the town centre and in Chilworth. The Committee is asked to consider these issues and the respective recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) is asked to agree that:

- (i) in respect to Onslow Village to formally advertise the proposals shown in Annexe 5 and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, if no representations are received the TRO will be made.
- (ii) proposals to resolve the issues listed in Annexe 6 within the town centre controlled parking zone are formally advertised and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, if no representations are received the TRO will be made.
- (iii) the proposals shown in Annexe 7 in respect to the area around Farnham Road hospital are formally advertised at an appropriate time during the redevelopment of the site, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, if no representations are received the TRO will be made.
- (iv) the proposals shown in Annexe 8 in respect to the area around the level crossing adjacent to Chilworth railway station are formally advertised and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, if no representations are received the

TRO will be made.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To increase the availability of space and its prioritisation for permit-holders, and to assist with safety, access and traffic movements in the area and make local improvements.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

Onslow Village

- 1.1 In the area of Onslow Village beyond the existing Guildford town centre controlled parking zone boundary, concerns have been raised about the impact that uncontrolled and inconsiderate parking has on safety, access and traffic flow, and particularly for emergency services and public service vehicles.
- 1.2 As part of the present parking review we have conducted two previous questionnaire surveys with occupiers within the area, in January and October 2012.
- 1.3 The original consultation in January 2012 primarily asked occupiers within the area about the parking situation in their road, and what, if anything, should be done. The responses to this were mixed. However, within the area currently being considered for inclusion within the controlled parking zone, there was a clear majority in favour of controls, of some sort, if other roads were to be subject to controls (see [Annexe 1](#)). However, there was less clarity regarding the nature of these controls. Views were mixed as to whether their road should become part of the adjacent controlled zone, or be subject to more limited controls.
- 1.4 Officers met with local ward and divisional councillors, who were keen for the small number of roads that were clearly supportive of being within the controlled parking zone, and closest to the existing controlled parking zone boundary, to be included. Officers advised that this could lead to displacement into the areas that were not controlled and the problem would simply move. To avoid the need to have to review the matter on multiple occasions an area for an extension to the controlled parking zone which covered nearly all the uncontrolled areas in Onslow Village was identified.
- 1.5 At its meeting in June 2012 the Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to further informal consultation about an extension to the controlled parking zone in the area identified. Again, the responses to the consultation questionnaire were mixed. Those in the small number of roads closest to the existing controlled parking zone boundary were again keen for inclusion within the controlled parking zone. Elsewhere, however, the level of support for inclusion within the controlled parking zone was lower than for the possible introduction of more limited controls (see [Annexe 1](#)).
- 1.6 Based on the feedback to this and the previous consultation, officers recommended that proposals be progressed for the introduction of more

limited controls around junctions, bends and at other strategic points, to assist with safety, access and traffic flow. During discussions with ward and divisional councillors officers were asked to design a potential control parking zone to cover the whole area so the Committee could still decide to progress this option.

- 1.7 At its meeting in March 2013 the Local Committee (Guildford) did agree to conduct a full informal consultation with public exhibitions on an extension on the potential extension of the controlled parking zone (see [Annexe 2](#)). Around 500 occupiers within the area were written to (see [Annexe 3](#)) and invited to attend two public exhibitions or view the proposals on the Borough Council's website. Notices were also erected on-street to notify road users of the exhibitions (see [Annexe 3](#)).
- 1.8 This report presents the feedback from the public exhibitions and recommends the next steps.

Other Issues

- 1.9 At its March 2013 meeting the Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to formally advertise various other elements of the present review, including proposals for the areas around Cranley Road, Dene Road, Rivermount Gardens, the St Luke's development, and around 40 other changes (these are covered in another Item to the agenda to this meeting). Since then, however, a number of other issues have been raised. These mainly involve relatively minor changes to accommodate newly created, or revised vehicle crossovers, and the like (see [Annexe 6](#)). However, a couple of them are more notable; namely the changes associated with the redevelopment of the Farnham Road hospital and the parking situation in Sample Oak Lane in the vicinity of the level crossing adjacent to Chilworth railway station.
- 1.10 This report presents lists the issues and recommends the next steps.

2. ANALYSIS:

Onslow Village

- 2.1 The latest stage of informal consultation involved holding two public exhibitions at Onslow Village Hall on Tuesday 18 June and Saturday 22 June 2012. In total, 163 people attended the two events. Over 500 properties were notified directly of the exhibitions / consultation. Street notices were also erected throughout the area.
- 2.2 The proposals were also available to view and comment upon on Guildford Borough Council's website, and many of those that responded to the consultation did so by email.
- 2.3 The feedback to this and the previous stages of consultation are summarised in [Annexe 1](#). In total, there were 118 responses. Of these, 109 came from those that were written to directly. A further 9 came from those made aware of the exhibitions / consultation via the notices erected on-street. A number of households, both in favour of and against the suggested measures, sent in multiple comments. For the purposes of analysis, these have been aggregated, to reflect the views of the household as a whole.

ITEM 8

- 2.4 The response rate equates to 23 per cent of those that we notified directly. This level of response is lower than the two previous stages of consultation (53 per cent and 47 per cent respectively), although it is at a level which is still of significance. Indeed, within the area being suggested for inclusion within the controlled parking zone, the response rate was 33 per cent.
- 2.5 Across the area consulted as a whole, 44 per cent of those who responded are either generally supportive or specifically stated support for the proposals, with 57 per cent generally or specifically opposing the proposals. Within the area being suggested for inclusion within the controlled parking zone, there is a lower level of support for the proposals, 40 per cent of those that responded being supportive and 59 per cent opposing the proposed measures.
- 2.6 When compared with the previous consultations, these figures show a drop in support for the proposals, both across the area as a whole and within the roads being suggested for inclusion within the CPZ.
- 2.7 Previously, when asked about controls in general, 60 per cent of those that responded from locations now being suggested for inclusion within the CPZ were supportive of the introduction of controls in their road, if controls were being introduced in neighbouring roads. Support from respondents dropped to 50 per cent when they were asked whether they wanted their road to be included within the proposed CPZ. Now that the specifics of the proposals have been developed, support has dropped to 40 per cent.
- 2.8 Nevertheless, within certain roads, such as Ellis Avenue, Orchard Road and West Meads, the desire for their road's inclusion within the adjacent CPZ remains. In others, such as Bannisters Road and The Crossway, the level of support has reduced. Meanwhile, a low level of support remains in locations such as Litchfield Way, Manor Way (The Crossways-Abbots Close), The Square and Vicarage Gate, which were earmarked for inclusion within the CPZ.

Other Issues

- 2.9 The locations where changes are required to accommodate new and amended vehicle crossovers and improve access arrangements (Denzil Road, Guildford Park Avenue, Jenner Road, Pewley Way, Poltimore Road) are listed in Annexe 6. Also listed is a proposal to extend the existing Permit A Only parking bay outside No.1-4 Artillery Road westwards. The redevelopment of a garage block adjacent to No.1 Artillery Road into flats has resulted in there no longer being the need for vehicular access to and from these facilities. As a result, an opportunity has arisen to increase the availability of parking space. Additionally, there is a proposal to convert one of the smaller unrestricted parking bays in Upper Edgeborough Road into a 2-hour limited waiting or permit I shared-use parking place. This is suggested in order to meet the needs of the small number of permit-holders that live in the road, which currently has no spaces prioritised for permit-holders.
- 2.10 In late 2010, Parking Services was contacted by those involved in the potential redevelopment of the Farnham Road hospital site as part of their planning submission. The hospital is bound by Area B of the CPZ on its

eastern flank and by Area F of the CPZ on its western boundary. Various changes to the vehicular access arrangements to the site were envisaged. In turn these would require changes to the formalised parking controls in the vicinity. In some locations parking spaces will be lost, whilst in others, opportunities to create a comparable number of additional spaces will become available. In general, the losses of space will occur in Area F, where on the whole, there are many more spaces than permit-holders.

- 2.11 The compensatory spaces provided will be in Area B, where there is generally greater pressure on parking. The proposed amendments are shown in Annexe 7. However, rather than advertising this particular proposal at the earliest opportunity, it is anticipated that it will be timed to coincide with the development. This will avoid the possibility of the Committee's authority lapsing after 2 years. This can be an issue in the case of major developments, of lengthy durations.
- 2.12 At the beginning of the year correspondence was received from a train driver concerned about the potential issues caused by parked vehicles in the vicinity of the level crossing in Sample Oak Lane, next to Chilworth railway station. It was suggested that vehicles parked adjacent to the new residential development could cause vehicles using the road to become stranded on the railway line when the level crossing barriers are lowered. Correspondence was subsequently received from Shalford Parish Council suggesting that an incident occurred, requiring the driver of a vehicle to reverse off the level crossing into the vehicle behind, in order to avoid becoming stuck between the barriers as a train approached. Subsequently, the County Council received an edition of LX News (Level Crossing news) published by First Great Western Trains, which referred to this particular level crossing and parking. As a stop-gap, Surrey County Council – Highways, in consultation with Surrey Police, agreed to install temporary barriers to prevent parking by physical means. Despite their temporary nature, unfortunately, these have not been welcomed universally.
- 2.13 Ordinarily, issues falling outside of the focus of a particular parking review (currently the town centre controlled parking zone), would have to wait for the next review before it could be considered. However, given the significant safety implications involved, it is considered appropriate to progress the matter as part of this review. The proposals shown in Annexe 8 highlight measures aimed at addressing these concerns.

3. OPTIONS:

Onslow Village

- 3.1 The Committee could decide to do nothing. However, this would not resolve the safety, access and traffic concerns raised previously, and by many across the area during the various stages of informal consultation.
- 3.2 The Committee could choose to revert to the option previously recommended by officers at the March 2013 meeting of the Local Committee (Guildford), namely to introduce more limited controls around junctions, bends and at other strategic points (see Annexe 4). This would aim to address the safety, access and traffic concerns raised previously and by many during the various stages of informal consultation. However, such measures would not prioritise

ITEM 8

parking for residents and visitors. Nor would they necessarily regulate parking in the immediate vicinity of driveways, which is a concern amongst some. Nevertheless, it would maximise the amount of parking space remaining, and its flexibility of use, thereby reducing the potential for displacement of parking into adjacent uncontrolled areas. The latter is a concern amongst some beyond the proposed CPZ boundary.

- 3.3 Officers have met with local ward and divisional councillors, and discussed the feedback from the public exhibition consultation with them. Another option would be to introduce a limited extension to the controlled parking zone in roads which clearly support the proposal but with some unrestricted parking bays to limit the potential for displacement. The roads suggested for inclusion within the smaller, revision to the CPZ are Bannisters Road (Hedgeway-Orchard Road), Ellis Avenue, West Meads (Ellis Avenue-Orchard Road) and Wilderness Road (Queen Eleanors Road-Orchard Road).
- 3.4 This option is presented in Annexe 5. The provision of unrestricted parking is designed to reduce the amount of parking displaced if the proposal is implemented. Most of the properties have off-street parking and the demand from residents does not require all the parking to be restricted. The unrestricted parking also provides a facility for residents and their visitors to use on Saturdays without the need for a permit. Where possible the unrestricted parking has been proposed away from residential properties.
- 3.5 It is also suggested that the echelon parking immediately outside the shopping parade at The Square be subject to a 4-hour limited waiting restriction to encourage turnover and help ensure the availability of space for visitors to the shops. Additionally, it is suggested that the junctions, bends and other strategic points in the roads beyond the revised boundary be protected by yellow line waiting restrictions, to resolve existing and potential parking issues.
- 3.6 Alternatively, the Committee could decide to formally advertise the proposals recently presented to the public at the exhibitions (see Annexe 2). Whilst this would aim to address the safety, access and traffic concerns raised previously and by many during the various stages of informal consultation, there would not appear to be widespread support for such controls within the wider area over which the CPZ would operate.

Other Changes

- 3.7 The Committee could decide to do nothing. However, this would not resolve the safety, access and traffic concerns. The Committee could decide to move forward with some but not all of the proposals or could ask officers to reconsider some or all of the proposals.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

Onslow Village

- 4.1 Following on from the two previous stages of consultation in January and October 2012, the latest stage of informal consultation involved holding two public exhibitions at Onslow Village Hall on Tuesday 18 June and Saturday 22 June 2012. In total, 163 people attended the two events. Over 500 properties were notified directly of the exhibitions / consultation. The wider

public were made aware of the exhibitions / consultation via the notices erected on-street, and the proposals were also available to view and comment upon on Guildford Borough Council's website.

Onslow Village and Other Changes

- 4.2 If the Committee agrees to progress towards making changes to the controls, the introduction of and changes to formalised parking restriction requires us to publish a notice of intent, inviting representations. We would report any unresolved representations received, back to the Committee for its consideration. Only then would it be possible for the traffic regulation order to be made and the changes implemented.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The cost of implementing this and the various other elements of the present parking review, will like previous reviews, not exceed £50,000. This would be covered by the surplus from on-street parking account.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 None. Nevertheless, if requests for disabled bays are received by the County Council from specific residents within the area being considered, we would formalise these, thereby making them enforceable, and thus, less likely to be abused and misused by non-blue badge holders.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The proposals will primarily affect motorists, be they from Guildford, the surrounding Borough, throughout Surrey, or from elsewhere. The measures are primarily aimed at improving safety, access and traffic flow. In the case of the proposals for Onslow Village, some of the options available prioritise parking space for residents and their visitors.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

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 where large, public service vehicles utilise relatively narrow roads. One such service runs through Onslow Village, where it is suggested the parking already has a detrimental impact.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 In respect to Onslow Village the option preferred by local ward and divisional councillors is a partial extension of the CPZ and a plan showing a suggested layout is attached as Annexe 5.
- 9.2 In order to improve and maintain safety, access and traffic flow, it is recommended that the controls proposed in Annexes 6, 7 & 8 are progressed, and formally advertised with a view to implementing them.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Committee agrees to progress towards making changes to the controls, the introduction of and changes to formalised parking restriction requires us to publish a notice of intent, inviting representations. We would report any unresolved representations received back to the Committee for its consideration.
- 10.2 In the case of Onslow Village, the 500 occupiers within the area would again be written to directly to make them aware of the Committee's intentions.

Contact Officer:

Kevin McKee, Parking Services, Manager (01483 444530)

Consulted:

Occupiers of properties within the roads listed in Annexe 1,
Those that read the street notices and / or viewed the proposals on Guildford Borough Council's website,
Those that attended the public exhibitions held at Onslow Village Hall on 18 and 22 June 2013,
Local ward and divisional councillors.

Annexes:

- 1 – Onslow Village - Combined results of public exhibitions and previous consultations
2 – Onslow Village - Proposals consulted upon at the public exhibitions
3 – Onslow Village - Copy of letter and street notice notifying occupiers and others of the public exhibitions / consultation
4 – Onslow Village - Proposals for more limited controls
5 – Onslow Village – Revised proposals for CPZ extension
6 – Town Centre CPZ - Additional locations where authority to formally advertise proposals is requested
7- Town Centre CPZ - Proposals to accommodate changes to the access arrangements associated with the Farnham Road hospital redevelopment
8 – Parished Areas - Proposals in the vicinity of the level crossing at Chilworth railway station

Sources/background papers:

- Item 6, Local Committee (Guildford), 22 September 2011.
- Item 9, Local Committee (Guildford), 13 June 2012.
- Item 8, Local Committee (Guildford), 13 March 2013.

This page is intentionally left blank