



Local Highway Authority: Parking Best Practice Research

Citywide Parking Review

October 2012

Brighton & Hove City Council



Issue and revision record

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
A	01/10/12	M Ring	R Hearle		1 st Draft Issue

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Mott MacDonald has been requested to assist Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC) with progressing the Citywide Parking Review (CPR).

The CPR is a thorough and detailed review of the City's current parking management policies and will be informed by consultation with residents, businesses and other stakeholders.

The end product of the CPR will be a suite of policy recommendations together with a proposed timetable for ongoing parking reviews.

One aspect of the CPR is a process of developing an understanding of best practice through an online survey sent to a number of UK based Local Highway Authorities asking what parking management operations they use, problems they or their residents/business owners encounter and what practices/policies they have adopted to mitigate these problems.

They were also asked to leave contact details should they be willing to accept follow-up telephone calls from Mott MacDonald to further discuss the answers given, should they be pertinent to the CPR, for the possible development of best practice examples that might be considered for adoption in Brighton and Hove.

The questions asked in the survey and the answer options were as follows:

1. Please confirm the name of your Local Authority.
2. Does your council operate any of the following?
 - a. Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ)
 - b. Residents' Parking Zones (RPS)
 - c. On-Street pay and display
 - d. Permit only schemes (resident, business etc)
 - e. Park and Ride
 - f. Sustainable on-street parking provision
 - g. Use of innovative parking management technology
 - h. 'Smart' parking enforcement
 - i. Other (to be specified)
3. Does your council experience problems associated with the following issues?
 - a. On-street parking controls
 - b. Parking controls in urban areas
 - c. On-street parking charges
 - d. Footway or verge parking
 - e. Commuter or long term visitor parking

- f. Displaced parking demand
 - g. Van and/or HGV parking
 - h. None
 - i. Other (to be specified)
4. Does the council have a strategy in place to mitigate the problems experienced in question 3?
 5. Which, if any, of the following groups experience parking demand issues which they regularly report to the council?
 - a. Residents
 - b. Businesses
 - c. Retail/trade outlets
 - d. Visitors
 - e. Not applicable
 6. Does the council have adopted parking principles/policy, perhaps as part of a parking strategy (not parking standards as part of the LDF/LP)?
 7. Does your council periodically review this document?
 - a. If yes please specify
 8. If you wish to make any additional comments, please leave them here.
 9. Would your council be willing to take part in a short telephone discussion about specific parking issues?
 10. Please enter your contact details
 - a. Name
 - b. Role
 - c. Telephone
 - d. Email address

What follows in Section Two of this report is a summary of the survey results and any further discussions held with local authorities.

2. Online Survey Results and Discussion

The following section provides a summary of the results of the online parking survey and provides a summary of discussions held with authorities who provided further contact details.

2.1 Online Survey Results

Please see Table 2.1 for a summary of the results from each LHA who responded to the online parking survey questionnaire.

A total of 143 LHA were contacted with 35 taking the time to respond, which a total of 18 agreeing to be contacted to discuss their answers further.

As the purpose of this exercise was to gather best practice advice from local authorities across England this report only considers the responses from authorities who were willing to be contacted to discuss their response to the survey in further detail.

The majority of LHA stated in Q2 that they operate either a CPZ or RPS and on-street pay and display. Not many stated that they operate 'smart' enforcement or sustainable on-street parking provision.

Many LHA reported that footway or verge parking, commuter or visitor parking and displaced parking demand cause issues in their area. Few authorities stated that on-street parking charges and parking controls in outer urban areas were causing issues in their area. Residents, businesses and retail outlets were the groups the council suggest experience parking demand issues and regularly report them to the council.

Eight of the 18 authorities stated they have a strategy in place to mitigate any parking issues experienced. 15 authorities stated they have a parking strategy in place, of which 14 periodically review. A number of the responses stated that the parking strategy is reviewed annually.

Analysis of these responses suggested there could be a benefit to contacting a number of these authorities further as the operations, problems and groups experiencing these problems are similar to those experienced by residents and businesses of Brighton & Hove.

Section 2.2 of this report summarises the outcome of the discussions between Mott MacDonald and a number of authorities identified for additional more detailed discussions following completion of the online survey.

2.2 Best Practice Discussions

LHA were chosen for further discussion based on a number of issues including the answers given to certain questions that were considered pertinent to Brighton and Hove, along with the type and location of the LHA.

What follows below is a summary of the telephone discussions held with the short-listed LHA that (a) agreed to further discussions, and (b) were available to discuss their answers in more detail.

2.2.1 Middlesbrough Council

Footway and verge parking is a problem for Middlesbrough Council, which is mainly experienced in residential areas due to oversubscription. The issue is monitored by highway maintenance and where appropriate, this is supported by grass-crete or stopped by using physical measures.

They are currently drafting a report for Members on options for addressing this issue of pavement parking and preparing a draft policy for the council to adopt.

2.2.2 Blackpool Council

Again, the main issue for Blackpool of interest to the CPR was footway/verge parking. Any parking undertaking of the highway and adjacent to yellow line restrictions are enforced for highway safety reasons and for *sending out the correct message*. Where yellow lines are not present, liaison with the police are undertaken to consider whether obstruction is relevant on an individual case basis.

The use of Permit Parking Only Beyond This Point (TSRGD Diag. No. 663.3) signs have been used in a number of areas. Problems have been experienced at the Traffic Penalty Tribunal (TPT) with the effectiveness of these signs for larger areas and therefore, the use of non-prescribed road markings have been used to reinforce the zone entry signs. These have been commented on favourably by the TPT (refer to figure 2.2).

They are currently exploring powers to be granted through an accreditation scheme for CEOs to enforce footway parking away from yellow lines as a community friendly approach to parking enforcement. This is seen as a way forward to reduce costs currently incurred by

subsidising the PCSOs in Blackpool that undertake some parking enforcement duties.

Credit card payment is accepted for all on and off-street parking that is considered to be a valuable service to visitors to simplify the payment for parking process and is considered convenient. It is acknowledged that there is a cost to upgrade the P&D system to accept these payment types.

Table 2.2: Reinforcing the use of Permit Parking Only Beyond This Point (TSRGD Diag. No. 663.3) signs in Blackpool, with road markings across the zone entrance boundary. This is a non-prescribed road marking and currently requires DfT approval.



Source: Mott MacDonald

2.2.3 London Borough of Islington

The LBI use GPRS to monitor CEO movements (70 on street at any time) for the enforcement of 1,400 streets (divided into areas and beats) and this data is cross referenced with PCN outputs. There is an expectation of what a beat should yield with regard to PCNs and if the level drops then better performing CEOs are moved in to the area to test the area. Continual monitoring ensures enforcement is effective and efficient.

They also use LogiXML dashboard reporting to interrogate datasets and explore all data available from beats, CEOs and PCNs etc. It was stated that the borough would be happy to discuss these features in more detail and provide a demonstration should BHCC think this is worthwhile.

The borough currently has over 1,000 P&D machines in operation mostly for short stay (less than 4 hours). So far 140 have been removed and replaced by pay by phone technology; the sites are chosen for removal by identifying the P&D machines that yield the least return. Those machines removed are stored and used for spare parts. The system is proving successful and brings longer term financial benefits.

The pay by phone system is also used for residents' e-permits removing the need to display permits in the vehicle reducing administration costs significantly. Enforcement is effective through the use of ANPR systems in the hand held computers and using mobile CCTV.

The e-permit system is being rolled out to include visitors' permits by the end of 2012 to further reduce on going costs.

Further opportunities are being considered to the way parking services are provided and managed as the business model moves away from a high dependency on PCN issue rates. Options include unused visitors permits being available to other users.

2.2.4 Swindon Borough Council

Although enforcement of parking on the footway/verge is undertaken where yellow lines are present, away from yellow lines Members are reluctant to enforce this type of parking due to the issues that are likely to result from this as it is often in residential areas.

In areas of persistent parking on footways and verges amendments to parking controls are explored and often result in consultation exercises and if appropriate, remedial measures are introduced to either protect the footway areas or hard surfaces introduced to support formalisation of the parking.

They have also introduced pay by phone technology for the majority of the off-street car parks where cash only P&D machines were available. This has been very popular with visitors and the local public alike.

2.2.5 Norwich City Council

Footway and verge is a problem for the city council outside permit zones. This problem is addressed for safety reasons but difficulties arise when attempts are made to address in some areas. Enforcement is undertaken against drop kerbs and adjacent to yellow lines.

Car clubs are being promoted to reduce demand and also exploring community lead 'place streets' initiative. They are also consider and are promoting the concept of being within a CPZ/RPS as a club and with that comes other benefits such as subsidies for sustainable travel options in the city.

Permits for larger vehicles are charged at a premium rate in controlled parking areas and there is a cap on the number of permits a registered address can obtain.

2.2.6 Derby City Council

The issue of footway parking has been addressed in certain locations by formalising with 'grasscrete' and/or managing using mini posts to eliminate off-carriageway parking. However, in more sensitive locations softer measures are applied in an attempt to discourage footway and verge parking where it is considered inappropriate.

Electric vehicles are used by mobile enforcement officers.

GPRS is also used for managing CEO beats that records locations and times. This aids in the deployment of CEOs and provides useful information on the efficiency of patrols to ensure that areas that are required to be enforced are appropriately attended.

2.2.7 Havant Borough Council and East Hants District Council

The council has not adopted a blanket ban on footway parking partly due to the displacement issues that would occur, at once. However, they do acknowledge this as a significant problem for them and therefore, introduce and enforce yellow lines where there are highway safety concerns.

The council have also, where possible, used experimental schemes to better understand the affects of a scheme's restrictive elements and to establish whether the scheme should be made permanent, amended or removed and some other course of action pursued.

Pay by phone technology has been adopted and this has proved successful. This also works well for 'corporate accounts' whereby businesses – a good example being estate agents undertaking lots of trips – can open a corporate account with the car parking smart phone service provider and get discounted service rates.

Hand held computers used by the CEOs are in real GPRS to aid faster on-line PCN case management including photographs of offence. There are plans to link with map base TRO schedules. The system is also utilising QR codes on the PCN to improve payment opportunities and access to PCN information.

QR codes are also being used on TRO advertisements as part of the ongoing improvements to communication and accessibility with the community.

No CCTV enforcement is currently used but body-cams are used by CEOs mainly for H&S reasons but also to be used in certain circumstances for PCN case evidence.

2.2.8 Sheffield City Council

Mobile phone payment systems have been adopted and are proving to be a valuable asset to the parking services provided. Currently the scheme operates on 200 P&D machines for 1,400 parking spaces and accounts for up to 250 transactions per day. Although there is marginal benefit to the council at present, the broader offer to the user has been well received. They stated that an amendment is required to the TRO to allow payment by mobile phones.

The CEO enforcement beat patterns are reviewed every six months to analyse outputs and performance of CEOs but importantly, also to continually monitor the PCN rates in areas of the city so as to be smarter with CEO resource distribution to focus on key problem areas.

The council has not adopted a blanket ban on footway parking partly due to the displacement issues that would occur. However, this is a significant problem due to the nature of older housing developments, narrow city centre streets and car ownership levels increasing. Members are reviewing the issue of footway parking now as this is seen as real concern and one that should be sensitively addressed.

2.2.9 Leeds City Council

Displaced parking following the introduction of parking schemes is experienced; the 'doughnut' effect as parking control schemes have extended outwards. This has partially been addressed by introducing limited waiting during the daytime.

In some areas, residential footway parking is accommodated to absorb the significant demand.

Smartphone pay by phone technology has been adopted that utilises start/stop payment systems whereby the user 'checks in' to a parking area and 'checks out' when the parking space is vacated. The charge for parking is then calculated according to the duration of stay available in that location/area. This links to the mobile hand held computers used by the CEOs.

3. Concluding Comments

3.1 Introduction

A number of similar experiences with regard to parking management issues experienced by local highway authorities were noted from the discussions and from these, different methods of response was realised. This can result from a number of issues accept payment for parking using pay by phone technology.

3.2 Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the discussions held with those local highway authorities shown above.

- The council should consider the adoption of mobile phone payment systems for both on and off-street car parking. This should first be explored to ensure the most appropriate system is adopted and then if appropriate, adopted and expanded over a defined period.
- As part of the new enforcement contract currently being re-tendered, consider the adoption of technology to facilitate smarter enforcement practices and effective distribution of resources.
- The use of CCTV as a means of effectively enforcing in certain areas.
- Consider the adoption of permit only parking areas and the adoption of reinforcing lining to reinforce the measures introduced.
- Develop a methodology for appraising footway and verge parking demand and to prepare a policy/procedure for addressing the issue.