

TABLED ITEM



**Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 18 September 2013**

**Petitions [Item 4]**

<b>Principal petitioner/ organisation</b>	Rachel Lane, resident of Walnut Tree Close Attracting 342 signatures as submitted to SCC (162 of which came from SCC e-petition)
<b>SCC Division / GBC Ward</b>	Guildford South West/Friary & St Nicolas
<b>Summary of concerns and requests</b>	<p>We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to shut Walnut Tree Close/Woodbridge Meadows to through traffic, reverting them to no through roads, for the following reasons:</p> <p>To stop traffic driving on the pavement, compromising safety.                      The road is too narrow for 2 way heavy volume traffic • To cut accidents and constant damage to parked cars • To eliminate the severe delays caused by long queues of through 'rat run' traffic, waiting to exit the road • To allow residents, visitors, employees and customers normal unimpeded access to homes and businesses • To ensure quick access for emergency services • To eliminate through traffic, which delays traffic exiting the train station • To create a safe, pleasant route for cycling and walking between the station, university and industrial parks • To reduce pollution and improve air quality • To cut erosion to properties from road water • To stop confusion over the road name • To improve access enabling potential residential and business development • To enhance the river as a place to visit and enjoy, not see a traffic jam</p>
<b>Response</b>	Guildford Local Committee would like to thank Rachel Lane for bringing this matter to its attention. A response to the petition will be provided at the next formal meeting of the committee on 11 December.

**Public Questions [Item 5]**

**1. Submitted by Tina Bradshaw, resident of Guildford.**

**Mount Pleasant, Guildford, GU2 4DE – request for change of use to one way street**

There is a lot of unnecessary congestion caused on Portsmouth Road, Wodeland Avenue and Mount Pleasant. Would it be possible for **Mount Pleasant** to be made a one way street, preferably from Wodeland Avenue end to save the congestion caused on Portsmouth Road? It causes so many problems for traffic and must be a nightmare for local residents. I believe if it was a one way street, there would be less queuing on Wodeland Avenue as cars would

## TABLED ITEM

not have to stop at the top and wait for the bottom exit to clear, which is very difficult to spot from the top of the road.

### **Answer**

The Committee would like to thank Ms Bradshaw for presenting her suggestion of making Mount Pleasant into a one way street from the Wodeland Avenue end towards Portsmouth Road.

Surrey County Council receives many highway requests, such as making a road into one way. Initial investigation is carried out and, if deemed to be justified, would be placed on the running list for recommended further investigation. The running list will then be taken to a Transportation Task Group to be further discussed. The Task Group is comprised of local divisional and ward members, Surrey County Council Highways officers and Guildford Borough Council officers. The schemes that are approved by the Task Group will then be presented in a formal report and taken forward to a Local Committee meeting to secure funding. Only the schemes that are approved and funded by the Local Committee will be progressed.

The SCC Highways officers have placed Ms Bradshaw's request on the running list to be discussed in the autumn Task Group meeting.

### **2. Submitted by Guy Rogers, resident of Manor Road, Guildford.**

#### **Regarding parking on Manor Road**

We would like the double yellow lines extended (and to be enforced) along in front of the tattoo shop on Manor Road, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 9NR. We are in the process of having our vehicle cross over extended, at a cost off over £1,400.00.

Cars are often parked illegally on single and double yellow lines on and around the blind bend, please see pictures.

I am self employed and need to get my van on and off my drive way at different time of the day, and also for insurance purposes.

My neighbour (number 114) has a drive way, however due to the parking on the road- he no longer uses it for safety fears.

Manor Road is a very busy cut through road for locals, as well as a busy bus route. If something doesn't change I believe someone will get hurt.

We would like you to consider making parking changes to Manor Road.

### **Answer**

Mr Rogers raises concerns about the effectiveness of enforcement and suggests changing the restrictions in Manor Road.

We believe most of the parking that is in contravention of the restrictions occurs early in the morning or towards the evening. There is considerable parking pressure in the area and the worst times are when residents are at home. We focus most of our enforcement effort

## TABLED ITEM

during the daytime when the roads are busiest. In the short term we can schedule patrols in this area during problem times and in the longer term we will look at how our resources are allocated so we can provide a more effective deterrent “out of hours”. There are a number of areas in the borough where parking in the evenings and early mornings causes problems.

In 2010 we reviewed parking restrictions outside the town centre. Manor Road was one of the areas considered and we held public consultations, including exhibitions. The proposal was to change the restriction around the outside of the bend in Manor Road from single yellow line to 30m of double yellow lines. Mr Rogers commented on the proposal saying it looked good providing the restriction was enforced. The proposed double yellow lines were implemented.

We plan to bring a scoping report for the review of parking restrictions in the areas outside the town centre to the December Local Committee and this will present details of areas where changes to parking restrictions have been suggested. We will include Manor Road. There are more areas where yellow line restrictions have been requested than we can consider in one review; we will apply the scoring mechanism agreed by the Committee to each and make recommendations to the Committee accordingly.

### **3. Submitted by Normandy Parish Council**

Are Glaziers Lane and Flexford Road an ‘appropriate bypass’ for HGVs around Westwood Lane which has a height restriction?

*Reasons submitted:*

1. Both Glaziers Lane and Flexford Road are D class roads which have carriageways that have not been strengthened since the introduction of HGVs greater than 7.5 tonnes weight.
2. A precedent is set by Clay Lane which, although a main by-pass around Guildford town, has 7.5 tonne weight-limit restrictions with direct access and egress from the A3
3. The alternative routes suitable for HGVs greater than 7.5 tonnes are the A31 and A323 to reach Worplesdon, Pirbright and Normandy. These roads have no speed limits less than 50 mph
4. Weight Limits do not prevent HGVs greater than 7.5 tonnes from delivering or loading only prohibiting ‘through’ routes

### **Answer**

The Committee would like to thank Normandy Parish Council for submitting the question regarding the introduction of a 7.5T weight restriction in Glaziers Lane.

The rail low bridge in Westwood Lane results in high sided HGV's using Glaziers Lane.

SCC officers have discussed the possibility of introducing a 7.5T weight limit in Glaziers Lane with the Police, since all new restrictions require police support. The police would not support this proposal, as HGV drivers travelling on Hogs Back A31 are likely to use White Lane C18 to access the A323 Guildford Road, rather than Blackwater Valley Road A331. Since there are a number of commercial establishments in Glaziers Lane that generate HGV traffic

## TABLED ITEM

a 7.5T weight restriction (other than for access) would require close monitoring/enforcement to check the legitimate need for access, and so be effective.

### 4. Submitted by Worplesdon Parish Council

Worplesdon Parish Council wishes to request that the Guildford Local Area Committee introduces a managed programme to replace the damaged and missing kerbstones in Pound Hill Estate in conjunction with the planned resurfacing works, which form part of Operation Horizon. Please could this request be added to the agenda of the next LAC meeting?

The problem with the kerbs has largely arisen because the kerbstones were laid incorrectly. In addition residents drive over the kerbstones to park, which is exacerbating the problem. This issue has now been on-going for over ten years! The current appalling state of the kerbstones creates both a road safety issue and a health and safety issue particularly for the vulnerable members of the community i.e. the disabled/elderly and young children.

### Answer

The local highways team are aware of the problem with kerbs on the Pound Hill Estate. At some point in the past these were laid on their backs, so have a low upstand and are prone to being dislodged by vehicles. Extensive lengths have been removed and removal will continue as more dislodge. Replacement with correctly bedded upright kerbs will be relatively expensive, and will probably have to be locally funded since this type of defect does not qualify for repair from central reactive safety budgets. The issue will be reported to the Task Group meeting in the autumn who will prioritise local schemes for 2014/15 and make recommendations on the same to the Local Committee meeting in December (next meeting).

### 5. Submitted by Sheila Zazzera, resident of Wilderness Road

In relation to Item 8 of the agenda:

The statistics from the various consultations show that the majority of residents in The Square, Wilderness Road area are against CPZ in their stretch of the road, but are having an area introduced in front of the shops. Using the same statistics there is generally more households in favour of CPZ being introduced in Farm Walk/Wilderness Road and no controls are being introduced:

Farm Walk/Wilderness Road figures:

	Agree	Tend to agree/ General support	Disagree
Consultation 1	38%	13%	38%
Consultation 2	29%		71%
Consultation 3	33%	33%	33%
Average	33.3%	23%	47.3%

## TABLED ITEM

Agree & general support total of 56.3% as opposed to disagree of 47.3%

Having spoken to the Parking Office, these figures however, do not include the residents in Wilderness Road who live opposite Farm Walk. They are included within the Wilderness Road statistics.

Wilderness Road figures:

	Agree	Tend to agree/ General support	Tend to disagree	Disagree
Consultation 1	58%	10%	13%	16%
Consultation 2	55%			41%
Consultation 3	29%	29%		43%
Average	47.3%	19.5%	13%	33.3%

Agree & general support total of 66.8% as opposed to tend to disagree & disagree of 46.3%.

Further down Wilderness Road CPZ is being introduced, but not in the Farm Walk/Wilderness Road section. Why is this happening? The proposed restrictions would appear not to be taking into consideration the response of the residents.

It should also be noted that notices about this meeting were not issued in time for any petitions to be lodged and therefore the committee should consider further representations from residents.

### Answer

In response to Mrs Zazzera's question the recommendation in Item 8 concerning Onslow Village does not propose extending the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) around the shops in The Square. A CPZ is an area where all kerbside space is restricted. The proposal to extend the CPZ stops just north of the Square. Our recommendation is for limited waiting parking immediately outside the shops to create a turnover of space, but this is not as part of a CPZ.

In Annexe 1 of Item 8 we have broken down the views expressed about the Wilderness Road area into three, (a) Wilderness Road, (b) Farm Walk, Wilderness Road, and (c) The Square, Wilderness Road. Combining all three of these sections shows the full view from the Wilderness Road area. The first survey asked whether residents wanted controls in their road if controls were introduced in neighbouring roads, and the combined result for all three sections of Wilderness Road show 59 per cent of those who responded strongly agreed or tended to agree and 35 per cent tended to disagree or disagreed. The second survey asked residents whether their road should be included in an extended CPZ and the combined response from Wilderness Road was 43 per cent in favour, 52 per cent against and 5 per cent did not know. In response to the final consultation which presented a design for an extension to the CPZ, 48 per cent of people responding stated support or general support for the proposals and 53 per cent stated an objection or objected generally to the proposal.

The break down shows residents in the area of Wilderness Road around The Square are opposed to a CPZ and the residents of Farm Walk area have expressed mixed views but the south section of Wilderness Road is generally supportive.

A CPZ needs to have clear boundaries and the recommendation in the report highlights an area that generally has high support. It is not proposed to include roads in the south of

## TABLED ITEM

Onslow Village in an extended CPZ because of a lack of support. While the southern part of Wilderness Road has a majority in support this area would not link with the rest of the zone.

We normally look for high levels of support before introducing a CPZ. A CPZ has a significant and permanent impact on residents and if there is marginal support, this can change when people move. The level of support can also be an indication of the scale of the problem.

Within the recommended extension of the CPZ, it is proposed to include some unrestricted parking places to absorb some of the all-day parking and assist in trying to minimise displacement. This, combined with the proposed waiting restrictions around junctions, bends and at other strategic points, beyond the revised CPZ area aims to resolve many of the existing parking issues within these areas and pre-empt against potential issues arising.

The report presents the findings of three separate consultations. This level of informal consultation within one review cycle is unprecedented and is a reflection of the mixed views within the Onslow Village area. The findings represent the views of everyone who has expressed an opinion and within all areas there are some who support a CPZ and some who do not.

### **6. Submitted by Sue Walker, resident of Crossways, Guildford**

In relation to Item 8 of the agenda:

AS PART OF THE CROSSWAYS IS ALREADY IN THE CPZ AREA WHY CAN'T THE REST BE INCLUDED?

We share the same road name, pay the same council tax but don't have the same parking privileges!!

**Answer (see Question 7)**

### **7. Submitted by Godfrey Blight, resident of Crossways, Guildford**

Our property is not in the CPZ but right on the border. As a result we or any visitors can very rarely park our cars outside of our house. The problem as we know is commuters parking and walking to the station and people who live in the zone moving second cars outside of it often for the entire weekend. We can park on our drive so are more fortunate than many of our neighbours but constantly struggle to turn into our drive way in one movement because of cars parked right up to the entrance on either side. Badly parked cars are normally therefore the day or longer. This is a great inconvenience which is ongoing daily and blocks visibility when reversing out which is dangerous. We have had cars dumped for weeks outside our house, our daughter hit a passing car edging out of our drive and, on one of the rare occasions we did park on the road my wife's car was hit because a driver could not see fully round the corner and skidded into her car when a vehicle came to the junction the other way!

Looking that the proposal to be discussed next week it seems lack of response is being used as a reason not to extend the zone which quite frankly is ridiculous. On the last consultation the responses from residences on the Crossways was I believe 100% and 73% (53%

## TABLED ITEM

overall). So those that live with the problem clearly care. But on this further consultation agreed at the meeting we attended earlier in the process is stated at 23%.

So my first question is WHY WAS IT NOT MADE MORE PROMINENT ON THE LATEST CONSULTATION THAT PREVIOUS REPLIES/COMMUNICATIONS WERE BEING IGNORED THIS TIME AROUND?

We assumed as I believe did others that previous comments made were still valid, nothing has changed, it is wrong to now say there is no demand for the CPZ to include the Crossways as was proposed when this was last discussed by the committee.

IF THE SOLUTION IS NOW TO SIMPLY EXTEND THE YELLOW LINES AT THE JUNCTION OF THE CROSSWAYS WON'T THIS JUST INCREASE THE PROBLEM?

Less space without the defined parking areas will just mean more congestion, fewer spaces and more cars pushing up on to our driveway.

### **Answer (to Questions 6 and 7)**

Mrs Walker and Mr Blight are concerned that the officer's recommendation for changes to parking restrictions in Onslow Village does not propose that The Crossways should be included in an extended Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The report, Item 8 on the agenda, highlights in Annexe 1 the findings of three rounds of consultation undertaken in Onslow Village since January 2012. Part of The Crossways is already in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and the other part is not. We initially wrote to all households that were not currently included in the CPZ and asked whether there should be additional parking controls. The first columns in Annexe highlight the answer to the question whether a resident wanted their road subject to controls if neighbouring roads were. In The Crossways 100 per cent of households responded and 86 per cent (71 per cent strongly) agreed. In the second round of consultation the same households were asked whether they wanted to be part of a CPZ. In The Crossways again 100 per cent of those who were contacted responded. 71 per cent responded positively and 29 per cent negatively.

The final round was to consult on actual proposals for an extension of the CPZ. In addition to writing to the households previously consulted, street notices were erected and exhibitions held to encourage as wide a range of views as possible and to give people the opportunity to discuss the proposals. There were six responses from The Crossways, three from within the area originally consulted and three from properties which were already in the Controlled Parking Zone. The three views from properties which are outside the CPZ were categorised as follows: one stated full support, one stated clear opposition and one was against the type of restriction proposed. There was a similar pattern from the properties whose residents expressed views from within the existing CPZ; one was fully supportive, one was clearly against and one generally supportive. Overall, 50 per cent of those who responded supported the proposals while 50 per cent did not.

There was also a split in resident's comments about whether there was a parking problem. Those who supported the proposal said they had problems parking and those who were against indicated there was not a problem parking on street. One of those against the proposal was concerned that the introduction of controls would reduce the space available for parking.

The latest round of consultation presented a fully designed proposal for a CPZ, whereas the previous consultations simply asked whether residents were in favour of the idea. It is not



## TABLED ITEM

unusual for support for residents' parking schemes to reduce when people see the detailed layout of a proposed scheme. It would not be valid to assume that people who had expressed support for the idea also supported the detailed proposals. We have included the results of the previous surveys in the report so they can be considered. We would not normally recommend introducing a permit scheme unless there was strong support from the residents affected by it and the latest round of consultation did not show that support.

We encouraged everyone to express a view either for or against the proposal. The purpose of the consultation is to encourage as many views as possible so we can present the clearest picture to the Committee. We acknowledged the responses we received and, once the committee has considered all the views put forward and made a decision on the next step, we will write to those who have made comments.