

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Citywide Parking Review</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>5<sup>th</sup> November 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director, Place</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Owen Mcelroy</b>	<b>Tel:</b> 293693
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>owen.mcelroy@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

## **1. TERMS OF REFERENCE/BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 1.1 The City Wide Parking Review (“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 whilst balancing the needs of users overall. The review also seeks to examine the future of controlled parking schemes including scheme boundaries, changes to schemes and new schemes
- 1.2 The terms of reference for the review were first set out in the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting report of 4 October 2011 Item 43 paragraph 3.7. “...public on and off street parking ..individuals and businesses and their parking needs/habits and their perceptions of parking operations, enforcement and the amount and availability of different kinds of parking places...issues related to sustainable transport such as on street cycle parking and car club spaces...postal consultation of 6000 random addresses across the city (and) ... via the councils website. Relevant stakeholders will be contacted directly for their views...”
- 1.3 The exact detail of the review and range of survey questions would be determined by officers but this would be in consultation with the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC.) A number of meetings and workshop panels were held with ECSOSC between October 11 and March 12 and those discussions informed the direction of the review.
- 1.4 Following a six month period of stakeholder engagement a further refinement of the terms of reference was agreed at Environment Cabinet Member meeting in May 2012
- 1.5 These were to: focus on main topic areas identified during the stakeholder engagement (See 6.1); continue that engagement noting any important new issues; conduct the postal survey; gather comparative intelligence from similar highway authorities; analyse results and produce recommendations; report to the relevant committee with policy recommendations including a proposed timetable of parking scheme consultations

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 Members to comment on the progress of the parking review to date and agree to forward concerns to the January 2013 Transport Committee

### **3. PROCESS OF REVIEW/ PROGRESS TO DATE.**

- 3.1 The review is in three phases
- 3.2 Community Engagement phase - identifying and reporting issues. Completed by end of July 2012 .Over 40 LAT, resident association and community group meetings attended and detailed notes taken.
- 3.3 Main consultation phase in two parts
  1. Detailed consultation with stakeholders, including ward members on issues identified - in progress.
  2. Sample postal consultation of 6000 residents city wide - in progress
- 3.4 Analysis phase including feedback from the postal consultation – in progress.
- 3.5 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
- 3.6 Over 250 items of correspondence received
- 3.7 A survey of Local Highway Authorities Parking Best Practice was commissioned through consultants Mott McDonald. 143 local authorities were contacted of which 34 responded (25%). 18 were interviewed in detail.

### **4. NOTEWORTHY DEVELOPMENTS SINCE OCTOBER 2011:**

- 4.1 July 12 Preston Park off road parking controls implemented & some bays in Preston Park Avenue converted to 11 hour shared use
- 4.2 September 12 Richmond Heights Area C and Canning Street Area H extensions implemented.
- 4.3 Consultation in progress on Moulsecoomb and Coldean proposed match day parking schemes
- 4.4 Consultation in progress on proposed Area J extension, north of London Road station and Round Hill Area
- 4.5 Parking fees & charges review conducted as part of annual budget process
- 4.6 On line resident, business and trader permit renewal introduced
- 4.7 Camera enforcement with postal Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) of loading restrictions in London Road and Western Road introduced

- 4.8 Parking Annual Report 2011-12 published which includes a considerable amount of relevant and up to date statistical information. See Appendix A
- 4.9.1 Government commissioned Mary Portas review of the future of high streets published, with 28 recommendations encompassing planning, business rates and parking. Point 9 “Local areas should implement free controlled parking schemes that work for their town centres” & point 10 “make high streets accessible, attractive and safe” are the most relevant.
- 4.9.2 National Highways and Transportation Survey 2012 published. Traffic & congestion ranks low in satisfaction with city residents relative to other services within highways

## **5. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION TO DATE: REQUESTS FOR RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES**

- 5.1 On the basis of correspondence to date officers have identified significant demand for consultation on new or extended controlled parking schemes from a number of areas in the city.
- 5.2 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, (eastwards from of existing Schemes W & R towards Portslade station and boundary road) Wish ward.
- 5.3 Of these areas the following have already been consulted on the introduction of resident parking schemes within the last five years. Bakers Bottom, Hanover & Elm Grove, Hove Park (part), Lewes Road Triangle, Wish ward (in part)
- 5.4 The current postal consultation asks residents whether they wish their street to be in a residents parking scheme and the results of this survey will not be available until January 2013. Therefore the above list of areas is not definitive or exclusive.

## **6. OTHER ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION TO DATE AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

- 6.1 At May 2012 ECMM it was agreed to focus on the main topic areas that had arisen from the consultation which are: verge parking, waiting lists for resident permits, times of parking scheme operation, displacement, critical examination of light touch schemes, enforcement, sustainability & parking, technology and disabled access issues.
- 6.2 The above issues were explored via the community and stakeholder engagement, the postal parking survey and the Local Highway Authority Survey

- 6.3 **Highway pavement and verge parking controls** – This is addressed through community/stakeholder engagement. Pavement and verge parking need to be distinguished. Parking on the pavements can create a significant obstruction to pedestrians, impact particularly on vulnerable road users and can cause damage to basement areas. Council policy is not to condone parking on pavements. Parking on 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 but 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. Further consultation and site visits have been conducted in Mile Oak and Varndean/Patcham in regard to the feasibility of verge & pavement parking controls in those areas.
- 6.4 **Waiting lists for resident permits.** This is addressed through community/stakeholder engagement. There are also questions in the postal survey relating to permit limits per household and charges for second and subsequent permits. This is most acute in Area M (Brunswick & Adelaide, Area Y Central Brighton North & Area 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 have been exploring potential options to reduce waiting lists in consultation with resident groups and ward members.
- 6.5 **Times of parking scheme operation.** Addressed through postal survey and awaiting responses for analysis.
- 6.6 **Vehicles parked in areas just outside existing schemes (displacement) and partially empty streets (underutilisation) in existing schemes.** This is being addressed through community/stakeholder engagement. Displacement appears most severe in parts of Wish, Hanover & Elm Grove and Queen's Park wards adjacent Areas W & U but can occur 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 are looking at the feasibility of certain options such as permitting streets outside a scheme to purchase a permit to enable parking within the adjacent scheme. This policy is adopted by West Sussex County Council in different circumstances of demand but officers have strong reservations. Permit holders in the adjoining schemes should have the opportunity to be consulted and there would need to be long term capacity. The idea also avoidsthe question of whether the streets outside the 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 also been consulting members on full or partial mergers of schemes or sharing of streets between schemes
- 6.7 **Examination of light touch schemes.** This is addressed through community/stakeholder engagement and the postal survey. 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, Area W has not yet been reviewed. Officers will look at the views expressed as part of this consultation, at the postal survey and at experience since March 2008. Take up of permits in light touch schemes is relatively low, 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.

- 6.8 **Enforcement.** This is addressed through community engagement, postal survey and local highway authority survey. Community engagement shows clear demand for more enforcement in areas outside controlled parking schemes, particularly outside schools.
- 6.9 **Sustainability & parking.** This is addressed through postal survey where there are questions relating to on street cycle parking, electric vehicle charging points, car clubs and motorcycle parking provision. At least one business has raised the issue of reduced permit charges for business permit holders with low emission vehicles and officers are exploring the feasibility of this.
- 6.10 **Technology & parking.** This is addressed through community/stakeholder engagement, postal survey and local highway authority survey. In response to demand additional on street credit card machines are being introduced e.g. in Madeira Drive, Brighton and Grand Avenue, Hove. The council has also included the facility for mobile phone payment as part of a framework procurement agreement with five local authorities which it can choose to adopt or not. The new parking contract tender includes a requirement that the technology used by the tendering contractor has such as hand held GPRS has to be compatible with mobile phone payment. GPRS stands for General Packet Radio Service and allows "always on" internet access which is essential for linking payment systems to enforcement and to the map based traffic orders (MBTRO) which may be trailed next year, subject to resources. More radical ideas such as street or car park embedded parking sensors to manage demand are worth exploring but require substantial capital investment.
- 6.11 **Disabled access issues.** This is addressed through community/stakeholder engagement and postal survey. A request has been raised by individuals and disability groups that the council look at the provision of permit specific disabled persons parking bays. These would be disabled bays marked on the road 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 be a means of improving accessibility to blue badge holders in residential areas where there is parking pressure often coupled with local facilities such as schools and community venues. Officers are looking into this further including the equalities impact.

Accessibility issues in certain off street car parks have been highlighted, officers from parking operations are discussing these issues with disability groups. The city council has adopted the Department of Transport's best practice for assessing and processing badges consisting of independent mobility assessments for new blue badge applicants and renewals. This has reduced the number of badges issued by about 250 a year. Applicants on higher level disability allowance qualify automatically. Nationally the number of blue badge holders has increased from 1.6m in 1997 to 2.6m in 2011. Locally the figure has remained roughly constant at around 13000.

## **7. LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES BEST PRACTICE SURVEY**

7.1 The survey was only submitted to the council completed recently and requires further analysis.

7.2 However the following points are highlighted.

7.3.1 Other local authorities are further ahead in the adoption of mobile phone payment systems & in technology for "smarter" enforcement by Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) e.g. GPRS linked to Map based traffic orders. Integration of technology is important to achieve more effective parking management and value for money.

7.3.2 The use of CCTV and mobile Automatic Number Plate Recognition has been effective in enforcement in certain areas.

7.3.3 Other authorities have introduced permit only parking streets with limited lining & signing. However this has resulted in enforcement issues.

7.3.4 There is a variety of approaches to verge and pavement parking but local authorities have not adopted a blanket ban approach due to concerns over displacement

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

### **Appendices:**

Appendix A Parking annual report 2012/13

Appendix B Local Highway Authorities Best Practice Survey

### **Background Documents**

1. March 2008, Environment Committee
2. ECSOSC City Wide Parking Review Report January 2012
3. ECMM Report Interim City Wide Parking Review May 2012