

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>City Wide Parking Review</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>15 January 2013</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director Place</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Owen McElroy</b>	<b>Tel: 293693</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>Owen.mcelroy@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE.****1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the outcome of the city wide parking review (the review).
- 1.2 The review is an investigation into the way the council manages parking through consulting residents, businesses and other stakeholders and learning from the best practice of other local authorities. The purpose of the review is to seek continuous improvement in the council's parking management services whilst balancing the needs of users overall. The review also seeks to examine the future of controlled parking schemes including scheme boundaries, changes to existing schemes and new schemes.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the Transport Committee notes the report and attached appendices and:
- 2.2 Agrees the short to medium term programme of consultations on proposed new or extended resident parking schemes set out in paragraph 3.10, depicted on the indicative plan appendix A and by the timetable set out in Appendix B, subject to the outcome of consultation, committee decisions and the availability of resources;
- 2.3 Agrees the general principle in relation to the consideration of new parking schemes as set out in paragraph 3.12.2
- 2.4 Approves the policy recommendations in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.27 of the report;
- 2.5 Makes any further recommendations arising out of the report that it considers appropriate.
- 2.6 Requests that in order to monitor progress on the review a report is brought back to committee in 12 months time with a summary of progress.

**3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:**

- 3.1 In 2001 the council took up the powers of decriminalised parking enforcement (DPE) under The Road Traffic Act 1991, renamed Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) under the Traffic Management Act 2004. Under CPE, parking enforcement is carried out by civil enforcement officers (CEOs) and is the sole responsibility of the local authority. Prior to DPE/CPE enforcement was carried out by the police, who lacked resources to adequately enforce on street parking except in cases of obstruction.
- 3.2 There are currently 14 resident parking schemes (including two light touch) and one seafront pay and display scheme, with a mixture of permit only, shared and exclusive pay and display bays. There are 25000 on street spaces and thirteen council run off street car parks with a total of 2500 spaces.
- 3.3 Parking controls are essential to keep traffic moving and provide access to residents, visitors and businesses. Parts of the city are the most densely populated in the country and the city receives 8m tourist visitors a year. The population is expected to increase to 283,700 by 2026. Current parking policy objectives are to reduce congestion and keep traffic moving, provide access safely to those that need it most, and deliver excellent customer service.
- 3.4 The Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2011 identifies Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) with priority for residents as a key way of delivering management of movement on the transport network to achieve efficiency and sustainability and reduce the impact of noise and air pollution.
- 3.5 Parking policies and resident parking schemes have been reviewed periodically. In 2004 Environment Committee approved simplification and consistency across schemes, mergers of 8 central parking zones and the abolition of voucher parking in favour of pay and display. In 2008 Environment Committee agreed the previous scheme consultation timetable and halted the development of new light touch schemes. It also approved consultation on converting existing light touch schemes U & W into full schemes and re-consulting on the single yellow line waiting restrictions around Hove Park.

### **Conclusions of Review**

- 3.7 The conclusions of the review are based on analysis of the community engagement and the postal consultation results together with a study of available data and from published and commissioned research. It draws on the expertise and experience of officers and consultants.

### **Proposed short to medium term timetable of resident parking scheme consultations**

- 3.8 Resident parking schemes have proved popular where they have been implemented. For example in Scheme J 84% of residents said they did not want their road to be removed from the scheme, this can be compared to 67% who originally voted for the scheme. Even the scheme with the lowest current support had 73% positive responses. Over the city as a whole more people thought they worked well for residents and their visitors than not. The feedback from the community engagement meetings in areas with residents parking demonstrated broad support for existing schemes.

3.9 There is significant demand for consultation on new or extended controlled parking schemes from a number of areas in the city. In alphabetical order and excluding those areas on the existing timetable the areas are: Bakers Bottom (Hendon, Bute & Rochester Streets) Queen's Park ward, a part of Hanover & Elm Grove ward (south of Elm Grove), a part of Hove Park ward (Hove Park northwards to Woodruff Avenue), Lewes Road triangle area, (between Upper Lewes Road and Lewes road) St Peter's & North Laine ward, Portslade South ward (south of Old Shoreham Road), Preston Park Triangle (roads between Preston Park Avenue, Stanford Avenue and Preston Drove Preston Park ward, and West Hove, westwards from existing Schemes W & R towards Portslade station and Boundary road), and Wish ward.

3.10 Of these areas it is proposed that the priority areas and justifications are; (see indicative map appendix A)

3.10.1 West Hove and South Portslade. It is proposed that parts of Wish Ward and South Portslade are consulted on separate full schemes together with an extension to Area R along Portland Road including roads to the north up to the railway line. At the same time it is proposed that Area W is asked whether it wishes to convert to a full scheme.

Justification - requests and petitions from residents, supported by ward members. This area is experiencing displacement from adjacent parking schemes and pressure from seafront visitors and commuters using the bus services along the through routes. South Portslade also has a significant retail and industrial areas and a busy rail station. Area W is to be re-consulted in accordance with light touch policy (see paragraph 3.16)

3.10.2 Preston Park Triangle & Lewes Road Triangle. It is proposed to start consultation in these related areas at the same time as West Hove & South Portslade. The Preston Park Triangle comprises the triangle of roads between Preston Drove, Stanford Avenue and Ditchling Road, subject to the current Area J extension consultation.

Justification - requests and petition from residents supported by ward councillors. This area suffers commuter parking for Preston Park rail station and is on several bus routes. There is also displacement from adjoining parking schemes and recently introduced controls in the park itself, which previously was free.

The Lewes Road triangle comprises the triangle of roads between Upper Lewes Road, Lewes Road and the Level.

Justification - A number of requests have been received from this area and it is supported by ward members. Problems have recently been experienced with access by emergency services in these streets due to congestion and parking on footways.

3.10.3 Hove Park & Bakers Bottom. It is proposed to consult these (unrelated) smaller areas following consultation on the schemes identified above in 3.10.1 & 3.10.2. Hove Park ward, roads between Hove Park and Dyke Road north of Hove Park Road up to Woodruff Avenue.

Justification - requests and petitions from residents supported by ward councillors. It is proposed to re-consult the area to the south subject to alternate single yellow line waiting restrictions in accordance with the light touch policy (see paragraph 3.16).

Bakers Bottom (Rochester Street, Bute Street, Hendon Street) will be consulted as a proposed extension of Area H.

Justification - requests from residents supported by ward members. At the request of East Brighton ward members it is agreed that streets in Craven Vale should also be consulted as they have previously been included in consultations for this area.

- 3.11 A number of requests have been made in the Hanover area south of Elm Grove. It is not proposed to include this area in the proposed short/medium term timetable. These areas could be considered for consultation or re-consultation for the introduction of residents parking schemes in the longer term. This area was opposed (72%) when consulted in May 2010 and is not supported by ward members. The narrow widths of roads suggest that any design would result in substantial loss of on street parking.
- 3.12.1 In some areas, e.g. Roedean, Rottingdean, Whitehawk and Withdean some requests have been made for resident parking schemes but these were not sufficiently reflected in community engagement and are not supported by ward members.
- 3.12.2 As a general principle new areas should only be considered for inclusion in future parking scheme timetables where there have been representations from residents, ward councillors and others within the area asking for parking controls. The council does not impose schemes on areas – schemes should only be introduced after careful consultation and if the consultation produces a negative vote it should not proceed. However in dealing with larger areas the council will consider the responses received and if roads on the edge of proposals reject a scheme a smaller scheme may be considered. Officers would consider the design and geography of the scheme and consider a natural boundary where possible.

### **Policy Recommendations & Information**

- 3.13 **Highway grass verge and pavement parking controls.** Pavement and verge parking need to be distinguished.
- 3.13.1 Parking on the pavements can create a significant obstruction to pedestrians, impact particularly on vulnerable road users and can cause damage to basement areas. Current council policy is not to condone parking on pavements and this should continue to be the case. There are two significant roads in the city, Nevill Road, Hove & Elm Grove, Brighton where there is historic unregulated parking on pavements and areas which were formerly grass verges but were hardened to a standard suitable for pedestrians only. Officers have been working with community stakeholders to find acceptable solutions to suit local circumstances.

3.13.2 Parking on grass verges can be obstructive and dangerous, particularly at junctions but objections are often made on environmental and aesthetic grounds. The council has no legal duty to maintain highway verges because they are not used for passage. However, persistent parking on amenity verges is unsightly and can lead to significant erosion. Replacing verges with tarmac can have a negative impact on surface drainage due to rapid run off. Bollards can also be unsightly, require upkeep and impede verge cutting.

3.13.3 Last year the Department of Transport introduced new powers including signage for area based verge and pavement parking restrictions which can be enforced by the issue of penalty charge notices. Officers consulted with members and community stakeholders as to the suitability of these measures in their local areas

**Recommendations:**

- (a) Officers are authorised to consult residents in Elm Grove (Hanover & Elm Grove ward) on environmental and highway improvements in the New Year which will be the subject of a separate report to this committee.
- (b) Following requests from residents and ward members, and evidence of long standing problems, officers are authorised to advertise traffic orders in financial year 2013/14 for area based verge and pavement parking restrictions in selected roads in North Portslade and Withdean/Patcham wards. The specific streets and scheme boundaries are depicted on the plan in Appendix E.

3.14 **Permit specific Disabled Persons Parking Places.** A request has been raised by individuals and disability groups that the council provide permit specific disabled persons parking bays. These would be disabled bays marked on the road or on a sign plate with a specific permit number related to an individual resident. Other badge holders would be liable to a PCN if they parked in that bay. They could improve access for individual blue badge holders in residential areas where there is parking pressure often coupled with local facilities such as schools and community venues. The principle is accepted but further work and consultation is required as to the eligibility criteria that should be applied. The scheme also has to be financially viable.

**Recommendation:** Officers investigate further and bring forward a further report to this committee.

3.15 **Vehicles parked in areas just outside existing schemes (displacement) and spare capacity in streets in existing schemes (underutilisation).** Inevitably, a scheme in one area may displace vehicles to an adjacent area. This combined with the trend to high density living (e.g. conversion of houses to flats) and additional generators of demand such as access to rail stations and key transport corridors and the pressures of new developments, have led to more areas asking for parking controls. Other than protected countryside there are few natural boundaries. Whilst railway lines and dual carriageway roads can act as boundaries they are imperfect. Displacement is evident in parts of Wish, Hanover & Elm Grove and Queen's Park wards adjacent to the light touch areas W & U but occurs adjacent to any parking scheme. It also occurs in streets

adjacent to the single yellow line waiting restrictions around Hove Park. Underutilisation is linked to displacement but can be associated with the street environment (security/overlooking/urban blight), terrain, number of private driveways, patterns of daily demand and parking tariffs. Officers have looked at the feasibility of certain options such as permitting streets outside a scheme to purchase a permit to enable parking within the adjacent scheme (a buffer zone). This policy has been adopted by West Sussex County Council however parking schemes there work at lower capacities, typically 80%. Most parking schemes in Brighton and Hove are at 90% or above and the long term capacity is not guaranteed. For example the central Hove scheme had capacity five years ago but not currently. Buffer zones also avoid the question of whether streets outside a scheme should first have the opportunity to be consulted on a scheme in their area and whether imposing such an idea might be introducing a parking scheme by stealth. Officers have consulted members in affected wards on proposals for full or partial mergers of schemes or sharing of streets between schemes but there is no agreement on this. In the past light touch schemes have been offered as a solution but have well documented disadvantages, see 3.16 below.

**Recommendation:** Not to proceed with implementation of buffer zones.

- 3.16 **Light touch schemes.** Light touch schemes are where parking is restricted to permit holders only for two hours in the day, one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon/evening. They do not contain pay and display parking. In March 2008, Environment Committee considered and agreed a report that proposed that due to the problematic issues arising from light touch schemes and extensive single yellow line controls, principally the displacement effect, no further schemes were to be introduced in the city and the existing schemes were to be reviewed with a view to converting them into full schemes. Area U St Luke's was reviewed in May 2010, Officers have looked at views expressed as part of this consultation and at experience since March 2008. Take up of permits in light touch schemes is low relative to full schemes, at 70-75%. The enforcement costs are the same as full schemes. They do not offer flexibility of parking options such as short, medium and long term pay and display. On the positive side they reduce street clutter and can be popular with residents in those schemes.

**Recommendation:** that no further light touch schemes are proposed and that Area W, and the single yellow line restrictions around Hove Park are re-consulted for full schemes.

- 3.17 **Waiting Lists for resident permits.** Waiting lists are longest in Areas M (Brunswick & Adelaide) Y (Central Brighton North) & Z (Central Brighton South), 12 months in each case. This is historic and a reflection of the parking demand and housing density in these areas. There have been regular reviews of waiting restrictions in these schemes and six years ago the merger of eight small central Brighton schemes in two schemes Y & Z did have a positive affect. Officers explored mergers or partial mergers of schemes but there is no consensus and there is a risk of increasing internal commuting within larger schemes. Since the northward extension of Area C, residents in Richmond Place (Area Y) have been unable to park in these streets, exacerbated by the fact they are cut off from the rest of Area Y, residents have requested this street is moved into Area C. The option of converting some of the seafront pay and display bays into resident or

shared resident /pay and display bays would have a detrimental effect on the tourist economy (estimated £250K net reduction). Residents in Schemes M & Y already have the option of purchasing a discounted permit for specified council off street car parks. The postal survey has indicated that city residents support a limit on the number of permits that can be issued per household, but there is not clear support for charging a higher amount for a second permit. If permit numbers are not controlled through pricing, any rationing system raises issues of equalities and exactly what criteria to apply. Other local authorities do not seem to have introduced limits except by the mechanism of price although some suspend applicants from the waiting list if they have unpaid Penalty Charge Notices.

**Recommendations:**

- (a) That the option of discounted permits for specified council off street car park s is extended to residents in Scheme Z.
- (b) That a traffic order is advertised to propose removing Richmond Place from Scheme Y and transferring it to Scheme C.
- (c) That officers carry out further research and prepare options (including no changes) for limiting permits per household where waiting lists exist and bring a report to a future committee.

3.18 **Times of parking scheme operation.** During the community engagement process there was general satisfaction with times of operation. However the postal response was evenly spilt and of those who disagreed with hours of operation 83% wanted enforcement to end earlier in the day. Some residents wanted unrestricted parking on weekends or on a Sunday. Officers have considered this, however, the reason why restrictions are in force until 8pm is to make it easier for residents returning home from work to find a space near their home. As the city is a popular tourist destination demand for parking is particularly high at weekends so restrictions are there to help residents. In past situations where restrictions have been less, residents have campaigned for extensions due to displaced parking at those times e.g. Queens Park extension to Sundays in 2011.

**Recommendation:** that Committee approves the current policy of 9-8pm Mon-Sun restrictions for resident parking schemes.

3.19 **Enforcement.** Residents in existing controlled parking zones believe their areas are properly enforced. However community engagement shows clear demand for more enforcement in areas outside controlled parking schemes, particularly outside schools, shopping areas and footways and verges. Ways should be explored of increasing the enforcement presence outside Controlled Parking Zones.

**Recommendation:** that Committee authorises officers to explore the options for improving enforcement and come back to committee with a report at a later date.

3.20 **Sustainability and parking.** There is demand for increased on street cycle parking which increases with the number of bicycles owned in a household, but even non bicycle owners are more supportive than not. Council transport strategy (and LTP funding) includes a specific target to implement between 100 - 160 cycle parking spaces a year and a proportion of these will be on street spaces. Resident opinion was unclear on whether there should be more electric vehicle parking places and car parking spaces. The council promotes car clubs where residents can use shared vehicles by booking online. They work best in dense urban environments where some car club users subsequently choose to give up their cars and use car club vehicles so reducing parking congestion. It is important to be aware of developments in this field. There is a growth in the "Peer to Peer" model where users rent out their own vehicles to others on the internet. Companies like Hertz are aiming to have a significant amount of their car hire fleet installed with car club technology. Multi modal payment cards such as 'Oyster' could be applied to car club usage. Research is also being carried out into a one way usage vehicle, the car club equivalent of "Boris bikes".

**Recommendations:**

- (a) That the policies to implement on and off street pedal cycle parking bays are continued.
- (b) That officers continue to engage with car club providers
- (c) That officers also explore other alternatives to promote sustainable parking options in the city.

3.21 **Technology & parking - payment methods.** Cash payment can be inconvenient to the public and there are the costs and security implications of collection. Residents clearly want to be able to use credit and debit cards to pay for parking (78%). The council has already introduced additional on and off street card payment machines e.g. in Madeira Drive, Brighton and Grand Avenue, Hove, Norton Road car park, Hove. Support for mobile and smart phone payment methods was highest amongst younger age groups (67%), as these are the customers of the future the council should make ready. Other local authorities are further ahead introducing new payment technologies, it is important however that the business model works for BHCC as well as the users.

**Recommendation:** Cashless parking is supported in principle and is the subject of a separate report to this committee.

3.22 **Technology – other.** Westminster Council has trialled roadside parking detection technologies e.g. "Deteq" in streets around Leicester Square. Detectors are mounted in the road and vacancy can be checked by drivers using an app which integrates with their satellite navigation devices. The trial has increased the utilisation of both on and off street parking bays and parking attendants have been able to take on more of a marshalling role, reducing congestion. The system also gives historic data on availability of parking in the area and makes predictions for future availability. However rolling it out across the city would require major capital investment.



**Recommendation:** that officers are authorised to investigate the viability of a trial of this and similar systems and report back to a future committee

- 3.23 **Coach parking.** The negative impact of coach parking (in Roedean Road) has been identified by the Roedean Community Association. The council is continuing in its efforts to find a viable location and operator for a dedicated coach parking facility.

**Recommendation:** That, subject to resources, officers bring forward a report to this committee in the next financial year looking at coach parking needs and capacity in the city with a view to investigating viable options.

- 3.24.1 **The effects of parking controls and level of parking charges.** The most common comment by residents in the postal survey was either that parking was too expensive or that parking discouraged visitors/was bad for the local economy. Many UK cities have seen a reduction in visitor numbers during the unusually bad weather seen in 2012. Trends in Brighton and Hove have followed these weather patterns rather than changes to parking charges. Tariffs have also been simplified across the city to make the system easier to understand. The Mary Portas report (Dec 11) recommends “Local areas should implement free controlled parking schemes that work for their town centres” & “make high streets accessible”. However the response from the industry and professional bodies has been critical. The British Parking Association has pointed out that when parking charges were abolished in hospital car parks in Scotland & Wales, patient accessibility did not improve, instead a disproportionate number of spaces were taken up by staff and commuters to the detriment of visitors and patients. (Kelvin Reynolds Parking News September 2012) The Association of Town Centre Managers says in their policy statement “There is no such thing as free parking. There is always a cost to someone, somewhere. “The provision of free town centre parking for all town centre users is impossible”. Academic research also shows that these goals may be incompatible. Both the RAC foundation report “Spaced Out” and the London Councils “Relevance of parking to the prosperity of urban areas” report point to a negative impact. These reports suggest that scarcity of supply and a market approach to demand is most appropriate and that parking charges need to be set at a level to achieve 85% occupancy of spaces. This will reduce the amount of traffic searching for a parking space. It is also concluded that retailers exaggerate the spend by car drivers believing it to be 61% of retail spend whereas it is actually 31% and that the retail target group known as “wealthy achievers” are most likely to come by public transport. Chester recently had a “free after three” policy, but it was expensive to implement and there was no evidence of increased retail activity. Canterbury cut spaces and doubled the charges and there was no change in retail activity. Research also concludes that reduced on street charges would have a negative impact on the long term viability of off street parking leading to overall loss of parking in city centres. However a zonal approach to tariffs does correlate to the supply of parking spaces with demand however and this was the theme of the last tariff review. Recent changes to zonal tariffs have been made in Seven Dials and London Road areas in response to local concerns.

**Recommendation:** That the Committee notes this summary of research.

- 3.25 **Scratch cards for residents' visitors.** Although the number of resident visitor permits issued is rising, 319K in 2009, 416K in 2010 and 500K in 2011 many residents are unaware that they can purchase scratch cards visitor permits even though they do not themselves own a vehicle. In October 2011 it became possible to register for an on line facility to order resident visitor permits.

**Recommendation:** that Committee authorises officers to publicise the facility to purchase resident visitor scratch cards in an effective way subject to the availability of resources.

- 3.26 **Vehicle ownership data.** OSC asked for data on vehicle ownership by ward. Current information is based on the 2001 census and is available but no longer reliable. The 2011 data sets have not yet been released.

**Recommendation:** That when the 2011 data sets are released they are provided to the Committee.

- 3.27 **Motorcycle parking.** There have been requests for additional motorcycle parking bays, and more secure motorcycle parking bays, especially in the city centre. The council accepts the need to provide dedicated motorcycle parking as part of a balanced approach and for secure motorcycle parking to improve security and prevent damage. Officers are currently trialling a scheme for "drop lock" motorcycle parking which is more sympathetic to the urban realm than the upright frame type previously used.

**Recommendations:**

- (a) That when new parking schemes are proposed motorcycle parking is provided in every street where site conditions permit and that officers investigate the options for additional provision of motorcycle parking in the city centre.
- (b) Subject to resources and to evaluation of the bike locking trial, officers are authorised to extend this to other locations.

#### **4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The consultation for the review was carried out in two phases.

- 4.2 Community Engagement phase - identifying and reporting issues. Over 40 LAT, resident association and community group meetings were attended by officers and detailed notes taken.

- 4.3 Main consultation phase in two parts

1. Detailed consultation with stakeholders, including ward members, in respect of issues arising.

2. Sample postal consultation of 6000 households city wide. Headline results below, full report Appendix C

- 4.4 Stakeholder consultation has included site visits with ward members and community representatives and meetings with representatives of the Federation of Disabled People and the Disabled Workers Forum

- 4.5 Over 250 items of additional correspondence were received
- 4.6 A survey of Local Highway Authorities Parking Best Practice was commissioned through transport consultants Mott McDonald and 143 local authorities were contacted of which 34 responded (25%). A further 18 were interviewed in detail. Appendix D
- 4.7 Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a draft report on the City Wide parking Review on 5 November 2012 and identified the following concerns which are addressed elsewhere in the report and appendices: 1. The importance of preventing **displacement parking** 2. The use of **mobile phone technology for payment and identifying vacant parking** spaces 3. **Better use of other technologies** in line with other innovative highway authorities; 4. **Enforcement** of restrictions outside CPZs; 6. re-publicising that non car owners are entitled to buy **scratch cards for visitors**; 7. More information on the **number of cars owned** in each ward and how people use their vehicles; 8. **Schedule for parking reviews** and links with parking policy development. Points 1-8 are addressed in section 3 above.

#### **Headline results of postal consultation**

- 4.8 1842 people responded to the survey with 60% responding by mail and 40% on the online version of the survey.
- 4.9 46% of respondents thought that residents parking schemes work well / mostly well for residents and their guests, compared to 43% who thought they caused problems. 64% of respondents had concerns about how parking for visitors, shoppers and businesses are affected by residents parking schemes.
- 4.10 Of those in residents parking schemes, 84% of those in a parking scheme did not want their scheme removed from the residents parking scheme. 51% of respondents agreed / strongly agreed that resident parking schemes have improved the management of parking across the city.
- 4.11 42% of people agreed with the current hours of operation, but another 42% of people wanted to reduce the number of hours. Of those who disagreed with the hours of operation, 83% wanted parking enforcement to end earlier.
- 4.12 63% of people agreed / strongly agreed that there should be a limit on the number of permits issued per household in each parking scheme. This method of restricting multiple permits was favoured over charging a higher amount for a second permit, which 48% of people agreed with.
- 4.13 From residents who lived in resident parking schemes, 93% reported that they felt that parking was enforced around the streets in their scheme.
- 4.14 50% of responders agreed that more cycle parking is needed.
- 4.15 78% of respondents said they would make use of being able to pay by credit or debit card at pay and display machines. Support for mobile and smart phone

payment methods was highest amongst younger age groups with 67% of people saying they would use this method of payment at least some of the time.

## 5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

### Financial Implications:

#### Revenue:

- 5.1 The financial impact of any income from future extensions to parking schemes will be included within the proposed revenue budget for the appropriate new financial year.
- 5.2 There is a one off cost of £150,000 associated with the proposed verge and pavement parking restrictions. It is estimated that annual maintenance costs will amount to £12,000 but that these will be offset by income from PCN's of £25,000 per annum.

#### Capital:

- 5.3 New parking schemes are capital projects, which are funded by unsupported borrowings, and repaid from revenue using the income generated by the scheme.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw*

*Date: 27/11/2012*

### Legal Implications:

- 5.3 The Council regulates traffic and designates parking places by means of orders made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Procedural regulations require public notice of orders to be given and any person may object to the making of an order. Any unresolved objections to an order must be considered by the Transport Committee before it can be made.

The Council is under a duty to exercise its powers under the Act to secure the safe and convenient movement of traffic and the provision of adequate on and off-street parking facilities. It must also take into account any implications that orders would have for access to premises, local amenity, air quality, public transport provision and any other relevant matters. When considering whether to designate parking places, the Council must consider both the interests of traffic and the interests of owners and occupiers of adjoining property.

In carrying out consultation the Council is under a general duty to ensure that any consultation is fair. This means that consultation must be carried out when proposals are being formulated, that adequate time and information about proposals must be given to consultees to ensure that they can provide a proper response, and that any consultation responses must be properly considered in reaching the decision.

The Council is under a legal duty as a public authority to consider the human rights implications of its actions. Parking and traffic restrictions have the potential to affect the right to respect for family and private life and the right to protection of

property. These are qualified rights which mean they may be restricted where this is for a legitimate aim, necessary and proportionate.

The use of any surplus income from civil parking enforcement is governed by section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as amended. This allows any surplus to be used for transport and highways related projects and expenditure such as supported bus services, concessionary fares and Local transport Plan projects.

*Lawyer Consulted: Carl Hearsom*

*Date: 7 December 2012*

Equalities Implications:

- 5.7 An equalities impact assessment has already been carried out on the impact of resident parking schemes. There is also an EIA for the services provided by the parking team and that of the parking enforcement contractor. The proposed improvements in parking management are expected to increase access to convenient parking for all users including increased opportunities for blue badge holders to find spaces. The easing of pressure on road space will also benefit those who walk, cycle and travel by bus.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.8 Effective parking management contributes to reducing congestion and improving safe access contributing to the promoting sustainable transport usage and tackling climate change through reduction in carbon emissions.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.9 The review recommendations are not expected to have implications for the prevention of crime and disorder.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.10 Any risks have been identified and monitored as part of overall project management. Parking is a corporate critical budget and any risks that have been identified are detailed as part of officers comments in the report.

Public Health Implications:

- 5.11 Recommendations arising from the review may help towards reducing motor traffic in the city, and therefore the effect on public health in terms of harmful pollutants (and injuries sustained in collisions) will be beneficial to public health. Nitrogen dioxide, principally emanating from vehicles, is a respiratory irritant which is known to exacerbate asthma. There is a 3.5% increase in mortality for a 100ug/m<sup>3</sup> increase in ambient NO<sub>2</sub>. There is a 5% increase in hospital asthma conditions for the same increase in NO<sub>2</sub>.
- 5.12 **The majority of locally derived pollution comes from either diesel engines or older petrol vehicles. Generally vehicles are more polluting to the local environment if they are heavier, older or run on diesel. Therefore promoting travel choice has to be part of**

**a much more comprehensive air quality action plan. Parking controls are a positive contribution.**

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.13 The review will contribute to the following priorities in the 2011-15 Corporate Plan; tackling inequality, creating a more sustainable city, engaging more individuals and groups across the city. A specific commitment was given to “Review the effectiveness and impact of current parking schemes on the city, for residents, businesses and visitors”.

**6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):**

- 6.1 The main alternative to carrying out the review was to do nothing. However the review is a specific council commitment, therefore it is the recommendation of officers that it is carried out. Some radical alternatives such as abolishing controlled parking or having one overall zone for the city were put to Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC) in autumn 2011. These were not supported as they would run counter to the councils transport sustainability objectives. ECOSC supported the principle of carrying out a review and this was confirmed by decisions at Environment Cabinet Member Meetings in November 2011 and May 2012
- 6.2 Various policy options and their advantages and disadvantages have been assessed as an inherent part of the review process

**7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 To note the results of the review.
- 7.2 To seek approval of a timetable of consultations on proposed new or extended resident parking schemes and to update the existing timetable agreed by Transport Committee in January 2008 for the reasons outlined in the report which will take into account consideration of duly made representations and objections.
- 7.3 To make recommendations for future parking management policies for the reasons outlined in the report.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

1. Appendix A Map of proposed areas for parking reviews
2. Appendix B Proposed timetable for parking reviews
3. Appendix C City wide parking review consultation results
4. Appendix D Local Highway Authorities Comparison Research
5. Appendix E Plan of proposed area wide verge and pavement parking restrictions

**Documents in Members' Rooms**

1. RAC Foundation Parking Report “Spaced Out” 2012

2. London Councils relevance of parking final report Nov 2012

**Background Documents**

1. October 11 Environment Cabinet Members Meeting city wide parking review report
2. May 12 Environment Cabinet Members Meeting city wide parking review report
3. OSC city wide parking review report Nov 12
4. Parking annual report 2011-12

