

Committee and Date

Cabinet

11 April 2018

## New Parking Strategy Framework Part 2 – On-street Residents Parking Policy

**Responsible Officer** Chris Edwards, Head of Infrastructure & Communities e-mail: <a href="mailto:chris.edwards@shropshire.gov.uk">chris.edwards@shropshire.gov.uk</a> Tel: Tel: 01743 255474

### 1. Summary

At its meeting on 17th July 2017 Cabinet gave approval to undertake a public consultation exercise on a series of proposals for a new parking strategy. A 12-week public consultation was launched on the 22nd July 2017 and closed on 17th October 2017, a total of 2,486 responses and many additional individual comments were received.

Given the number and complexities of the issues raised during the consultation the reporting of the parking strategy framework was split in to 2 parts. Part 1: Implementation of the linear model was approved by Cabinet on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2018. A detailed assessment of the consultation returns is shown in the 17<sup>th</sup> January 2018 report.

This second report outlines the conclusions and recommendations for a new on-street residents parking policy. Estimated funding requirement for implementation of the policy is £30,000.

Formal TRO consultation will be required prior to both implementation of the new policy criteria for permit allocation on existing residents' parking schemes and again for amendment / introduction of any new schemes.

Implementation whenever possible will be dovetailed with the implementation programme for part one of the strategy which is as shown below.

In the larger market towns assessment and feasibility is estimated to take around 12 months.

#### 2. Recommendations

That Cabinet give approval for the implementation of Part 2 of the new on-street Residents Parking Policy as follows:

- That the proposed On-Street Residents Parking Policy detailed in appendix 1 of this report is adopted (including the increase of permit costs).
- ii. That the requests for residents parking schemes detailed in appendix 2 of this report are assessed and a programme for implementation is developed that best fits with the implementation of both parts 1 and 2 of the new parking strategy framework.

#### **REPORT**

### 3. Risk Assessment and Opportunities Appraisal

### **Equality and Social Inclusion Impact Assessment (ESIIA)**

An initial Equality and Social Inclusion Impact Assessment (ESIIA) was carried out by the Council in June 2017, prior to the public consultation exercise, and is available with the Cabinet papers from July 2017. As per corporate practice ahead of any such consultation on proposed service changes, this sought to identify possible impacts on the community and on Protected Groupings within the community, pending the views of communities, partner organisations and stakeholders.

Additional statutory Traffic Regulation Order consultation will shortly be undertaken regarding implementation of Part One of the proposed Car Parking Strategy. In addition, approval was given in Part 1 for several additional consultations to be undertaken e.g. a review of existing park and ride services.

Related service area strategy development about the Local Transport Plan is also underway, taking account of national, regional and sub-regional policy developments around physical transport infrastructure, including cross border access considerations.

A second equality and social inclusion impact screening assessment focuses on the development and implementation of the proposed residents parking policy. This considers potential equality impacts, either negative or positive. The screening assessment is a stocktake that draws upon the 2017 consultation. It acknowledges that more targeted effort is needed to seek the views of the groupings most likely to be affected by the introduction of a new

policy. The identified groupings who could face practical and physical access issues are; Age and Disability, Pregnancy and Maternity, Disability, plus the Social Inclusion grouping in which the Council needs to consider vulnerable households and those with caring responsibilities. Introduction of the policy will enable identified groupings to partake in TRO consultations, ensuring the impact of each proposed scheme under this policy is fully considered. The Council also needs to have particular regard to current and future demographic changes amongst the resident population.

A fundamental review of the existing Parking Strategy has identified risks, benefits and opportunities in many fundamental areas. The key risks have been identified and captured below.

Risk	Mitigating actions
Parking strategy proposals fail to meet Disability Discrimination Act ("DDA") requirements. Proposals fail to account for Equality Act requirements around consideration of likely negative and positive impacts of proposed service changes on Protected Characteristic groupings and on those at risk of social exclusion.	An initial part One and stage two Equality and Social Inclusion Impact Assessment (ESIIA) screening assessment has been carried out and considers potential impacts. Further screening assessments at timely points in the development and implementation of the Car Parking Strategy, alongside specific consultation and ongoing engagement, and analysis of feedback will be considered. This is to seek to ensure that evidence about likely impacts in equality terms is garnered and utilised in refining the Strategy to minimise any negative impacts and enhance positive impacts for groupings in the community and the wider community.
Forecast of increase in demand for car parking provision	A TEMPRO analysis, the Department for Transport tool for forecasting traffic and transport growth for Shrewsbury and Shropshire between 2015 and 2026 has been undertaken. The TEMPRO data predicts traffic growth in Shrewsbury to rise just below 5% and around 8.3% in Shropshire between 2015 and 2026. These are not large increases, but there should be a corresponding increase in car park utilisation. However, the new strategy framework is intended to promote transport mode hierarchy, with patterns of usage intended to change, away from car parks with current high demand into car parks with current surplus capacity compensating for any potential increase in use.

Risk	Mitigating actions
	The data demonstrates that the current and projected future demand can be accommodated within the existing and projected future supply of car parks.
Delay in the development of the new residents' parking policy impacts on the effectiveness of the parking strategy as a whole	Priority and resources need to be directed to ensure activities for the implementation of both parts one and two of strategy for each market town are programme co-ordinated.

### 4.. Financial Implications

The financial implications of the Resident's On-Street Parking Policy are comprised of two elements; policy implementation and provision of new schemes.

### **Policy implementation**

The total estimated funding requirements for the new on-street residents parking policy is £30,000. This includes the implementation of a new virtual permitting process as shown below.

Commission	18/19	19/20
TRO consultation and revisions	£10,000	£5,000
New virtual permitting – system development and implementation	£10,000	
Marketing and PR	£5,000	
	£25,000	£,5000

Further commissions are required and detailed in the report with respect to required Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation.

The implementation of the new virtual permitting process will allow the customer to change and update their details such as change of vehicle, without further charge, online and by telephone.

Resident permit holders will also now receive, without any additional charge, an annual visitor permit allowance. Further details of the new visitor permit proposals are detailed in appendix 1.

### Provision of new or existing resident parking scheme amendment

It is estimated that on average the cost of consultation, design and implementation of a new scheme will cost £88,000.

It is proposed to increase the cost of on-street resident's permits from £50 to £100 per annum, the additional income received from resident's permits over 3 years can cover the implementation costs and the additional demand on enforcement required for Part 2 of the strategy.

A breakdown of permit costs is shown in appendix 1.

It should be noted that legislation does not allow surpluses to be generated from on-street permit provision.

### 5 Background

At its meeting on 17th July 2017 Cabinet gave approval to undertake a public consultation exercise on a series of proposals for a new parking strategy. A 12-week public consultation was launched on the 22nd July 2017 and closed on 17th October 2017, a total of 2,486 responses and many additional individual comments were received.

Given the number and complexities of the issues raised during the consultation the reporting of the parking strategy framework was split in to 2 parts. Part 1: Implementation of the linear model and associated elements was approved by Cabinet on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

The Liberal Democrats called the report in, and the Performance Management Scrutiny Committee considered the matter at its meeting on 28th March 2018. The report was approved by scrutiny, to pass without change.

Since completion of the consultation exercise and after approval of part 1, requests, comments and enquiries have continued relating to both the nature and the progress of part 2.

This second report outlines the conclusions and recommendations for implementation of the new On-street Residents Parking Policy.

### Existing On-street Residents Parking Policy

The existing on-street residents parking policy consists of two types of residents' parking schemes:

Type A- areas or streets where existing or proposed parking restrictions are believed to be unduly restrictive on the residents of the area and the orders can be changed to be of greater benefit to the residents.

Type B- areas or streets where the demand for parking, by the residents and/or other visitors to the area, is greater than the number of potential spaces and restrictions are required to provide a better opportunity for residents to park within the area.

The type and limits of restrictions of proposed schemes should be defined at a site meeting with the local council member and the champion for the scheme. The local champion for the scheme is responsible for identifying the level of support for a scheme by obtaining signatures from the residents in the proposed scheme area.

The main criteria for justifying a residents' parking scheme is that there is insufficient space in which the residents of the scheme (being considered) can park because of existing restrictions and/or the presence of vehicles because of visitor or commuter parking.

Schemes are only prioritised once the Champion has obtained signatures from representatives of at least 30% of the properties within the proposed scheme

The requests are then prioritised, depending on the type as detailed above and the findings of the initial investigations. Type A schemes are given priority over Type B schemes as they are normally more urgently needed and easier to implement. These requests will be prioritised simply by the number of residential properties to be included within the scheme that have indicated support for the scheme via the champions, with the higher number being given the highest priority.

This ensures that the Councils resources are targeted to give the maximum benefit in terms of need indicated by the level of support and the number of properties that will benefit from a scheme.

Once a scheme has been prioritised and funding allocated to that scheme the Council are committed to the implementation of the scheme subject to the successful consultation and continued support for the scheme by the residents. A new scheme with a higher priority will not supersede a scheme that has already been committed to.

The number of schemes to which the Council can commit is subject to the size of the schemes and the available budget for Residents' Parking.

Informal Consultation is carried out when a draft proposal for the scheme has been drawn up to allow residents to have an input into how the scheme will look.

The new residents parking policy is designed to give the flexibility required to integrate with the linear parking proposals within part 1 of the parking strategy framework.

### Existing On-street Residents Parking Schemes

There are currently on-street schemes operating in Bridgnorth, Ludlow and Oswestry (permits in Oswestry are currently available free of charge).

### 6. Consultation exercise and responses received relating to part 2 -Onstreet Residents Parking Policy Proposals.

Details of the proposed new on-street residents parking policy were included with the consultation and are shown in full within appendix 9 of the 12<sup>th</sup> July Cabinet Report.

The resident parking policy proposals presented within the public consultation questionnaire are summarised in Appendix 3 of this report. Opportunity was given to express support or not, as well as provide additional comment for each proposal.

Over the course of the consultation period a total of 2,486 responses were received. There were 159 responses / comments received during the consultation relating to the Residents Parking Strategy proposals.

The following table shows the numbers in support or against each of the individual on-street residents policy proposals.

Table 1: Summary of consultation responses relating to residents parking

Resident parking		Yes	No		Responses
\$3.1	Alternative prohibitions, restrictions and/or traffic measurement measures		65%	35%	139
\$3.2	Feasibility proposal		72%	28%	123
\$3.3	Parking spaces greater than properties		71%	29%	114
\$3.4	On-street spaces less than properties		77%	23%	117
\$3.5	Parking space capacity		64%	36%	115
\$3.6	Parking scheme exclusions		68%	32%	105
\$3.7	Resident survey questionnaire		73%	27%	108
\$3.8	Public exhibition		88%	12%	111
\$3.9	Twelve month review		91%	9%	108

Full details of the consultation exercise including methodology, publicity, returns profile and a detailed analysis of the results are shown in Appendix 1 of the 17<sup>th</sup> January Cabinet Report.

### 7. Conclusions relating to on-street residents parking

## Consultation Proposal S3.1: Alternative prohibitions, restrictions and /or traffic measurement measures.

It is proposed that prior to any consideration for any Residents' Parking Scheme, the potential for the introduction of alternative prohibitions, restrictions and/or traffic management measures such as yellow lines, limited waiting should first be considered to address the issues raised.

Residents parking schemes are often perceived by residents as the most appropriate traffic management control measure when often it is more appropriate and cost effective to provide alternatives such as yellow lines, limited waiting / disabled bays etc. to address issues such as maintaining access, reducing parking congestion and maintaining highway safety.

The need for a residents parking scheme needs to be demonstrated from the on-set. Residents' parking schemes should be avoided where most residents have off-street parking or where there is sufficient on-street space to accommodate both residents' and non-residents' parking and there is not a displacement / congestion issue.

Given a residents parking scheme is usually requested primarily to help residents park their vehicles where vehicles not belonging to residents are making this difficult, residents' parking scheme requests will not usually be considered within the process and prioritisation procedures as part of the programme of measures designed to promote road safety. Rather, scheme requests shall be prioritised based upon congestion and amenity.

65% of consultation returns supported this proposal with no adverse comments raised. It is therefore recommended that this section of the proposed residents parking policy be approved without change.

### **Consultation Proposal S3.2: Feasibility Proposal**

It is proposed that a feasibility proposal outlining the properties and streets for inclusion in any residents parking scheme shall be prepared by officers and the views of the Local Member, Town /Parish Council and any local resident groups sought. Appropriate funding for scheme development / consultation shall also be identified.

72% of consultation returns supported this proposal. However, requests were received during the consultation highlighting the need for direct scheme consultation with residents in order that issues can be directly highlighted and options for treatment can be better understood. It is therefore recommended that this section of the proposed residents parking policy be approved, when any local resident groups are not identified appropriate effort will be given to obtaining rounded views of residents in the area.

From an equality perspective, this may usefully be carried out through community engagement that seeks to reach the community through channels such via the Voluntary Community Sector Assembly (VCSA) and via publicity in local schools, churches, community halls, leisure centres, etc.

All proposals must be considered a viable proposal that is supported at a local level.

Consultation Proposal S3.3: Number of parking spaces available more than the number of properties in the area, then resident parking schemes will only be considered if displacement of residents parking by commuter / non-residents is evident

71% of consultation returns supported this proposal with no adverse comment made. It is therefore recommended that this section of the proposed residents parking policy be approved without change.

# Consultation Proposal S3.4: Number of on-street parking spaces available less than the number of properties then a resident only scheme should be considered

77% of consultation returns supported this proposal. One comment was received suggesting that as with the existing policy, permit concessions to park on-street should not necessarily be available when off street private drive parking provision is evident.

It is recommended that this section of the proposed residents parking policy be approved without change to the proposal, but with recognition that if there is evidence of adequate off-street provision and usage, less stringent shared use residents permit /limited waiting restrictions may be introduced thereby giving greater opportunity for visitors.

# Consultation Proposal S3.5: Provision of visitor parking permits within a scheme proposal shall only be considered if parking space capacity is considered sufficient.

To ensure appropriate parking provision is made available to residents within a reasonable distant of their property as a priority, the overall number of permits allocated will be primarily dictated by the overall capacity of the road or street, with due regard given to the level and nature of visitor parking in the area.

The existing policy allows residents to purchase books of parking permits which can be given to their visitors, each book contains 20 ½ day permits. The new policy proposal is that each registered property in the area shall be entitled to receive a maximum allocation of up to 200 hours of visitors parking per annum, and through use of the virtual permitting system this will give greater flexibility.

As highlighted for proposal S3.4 above, there should be recognition that visitor parking may also be managed by the implementation of appropriate restrictions. For example, shared use limited waiting and resident permit bays may be appropriate during the day, with permit holder only restrictions in the evenings and at weekends.

64% of consultation returns supported this proposal with no adverse comment made. It is therefore recommended that this section of the proposed residents parking policy be approved without change.

Consultation Proposal S3.6: Option to exclude individual properties from a residents' parking scheme, as a part of the planning consent for that property, such as part of a section 106 agreement.

To promote the use of residential parking schemes as a traffic / parking management tool for new inset development and safeguard existing on-street residents parking provision it is proposed within the policy to provide an option to exclude individual properties from a residents' parking scheme, as a part of the planning consent. This allows use as a tool to manage traffic congestion, amenity and in the interests of maintaining road safety.

68% of consultation returns supported this proposal and it is recommended that this section of the proposed residents parking policy be approved without change.

Comments were received outside of the scope of the residents parking strategy with regards to the use and potential revisions to planning legislation, such as requests to relax conservation planning rules to promote parking provision.

### Consultation Proposal S3.7: Residents survey questionnaire

To ensure an appropriate proportion of residents surveyed within the scheme boundary support the scheme proposals before a scheme goes ahead, it is proposed that a survey questionnaire be distributed to all properties detailing the outline scheme feasibility proposals.

If the results of the survey indicate 50% or more of returns support and less than 50% of returns oppose the scheme (survey returns expressing a view that are neither for or against a scheme proposal shall be discounted), detailed proposals may be taken forward. If the overall response rate is less than 50% of all properties in the area the scheme may only proceed with the support of the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport.

Comments received from the consultation included concerns that returns to consultations are not normally that high, that the threshold for taking forward the scheme was too low and should be raised to 60%. There were also concerns raised with regards to allowing a scheme to proceed only with the support of the Portfolio Holder, with the suggestion that the decision should be at a local level, the local member is better placed. A further view was expressed that the policy should determine the parameters and there should therefore be no need for Member involvement at all.

Parking consultations are always an emotional subject, there are always those for and against change, and the best compromise needs to be found, the Local Member is usually well placed to articulate that balance. Experience suggests a high response rate is usually achieved and as such a high confidence level in the consultation results being representative of the views of the residents in the area can be expected.

73% of consultation returns supported this proposal. It is recommended that the proposal threshold to proceed of 50% or more of returns in support, be retained, but if the overall response rate is less than 50% of all properties in the area the scheme may only proceed with the support of the Local Member rather than the Portfolio Holder.

### Consultation Proposal S3.8: Public exhibition

Development of residents parking schemes requires extensive consultation and resource to implement. Comments received during the consultation included requests to ensure the community needs as well as residents parking needs are also addressed. A public exhibition will give opportunity for all parties to raise any issues or concerns that have not been previously addressed.

88% of consultation returns supported this proposal with no adverse comment made. It is therefore recommended that this section of the proposed residents parking policy be approved without change.

From an equality perspective, the public exhibition provides opportunity for people from Protected Characteristic groupings in the community to be made aware of the proposals and have opportunity to comment on them, and for these views to be recorded as potentially indicative of wider views about needs. Efforts will need to be made to ensure that material is clear in its content, and that the exhibition itself is set up in community places such as shopping centres to reach as many people as possible.

### Consultation Proposal S3.9: Twelve-month review

To ensure ongoing effectiveness and appropriateness of the scheme it is proposed that after 12 months have elapsed following the introduction of a residents parking scheme the effectiveness of the scheme shall be evaluated and reviewed and if necessary modifications considered.

91% of consultation returns supported this proposal with no adverse comment made. It is therefore recommended that this section of the proposed residents parking policy be approved without change.

### 8. Residents Parking Policy implementation and forward programme

Subject to Cabinet approval of the recommendations, it is proposed to commence the required statutory TRO consultation in May 2018

Appendix 2 of this report lists by town the requests for residents parking schemes on record and identifies if:

- i. a customer service request has historically been received
- ii. a request was received through the public consultation feedback
- iii. if it is considered implementation is required to support the parking strategy framework

Formal TRO consultation will be required prior to both implementation of the new policy criteria for permit allocation on existing schemes and again for amendment / introduction of any new schemes.

Implementation whenever possible will be dovetailed with the implementation programme for part one of the strategy which is as shown below and scheduled permit renewals.

Phase 1	Shrewsbury
Phase 2	Ludlow
Phase 3	Bridgnorth
Phase 4	Oswestry
Phase 5	All other areas

Priority will be afforded if support for the effectiveness of the overall parking strategy framework has been identified.

Requests for new / amendment of existing schemes in the larger market towns is estimated to take around 12 months. Given there are no proposals for new schemes in Ludlow, only amendment, it is feasible the new policy including virtual permitting can be implemented at the same time as stage 1. Substantial feasibility and consultation will be required in Bridgnorth and Oswestry and there is also potential to introduce additional pay and display alongside residents parking schemes in Shrewsbury, Bridgnorth.

## List of Background Papers (This MUST be completed for all reports, but does not include items containing exempt or confidential information)

Shropshire Parking Review (Initial scoping review) – May 2014

Report on Shropshire Parking Strategy - Mouchel - January 2015

Shropshire Parking Proposal Executive Summary Mouchel - January 2015

Shropshire Parking Implementation Plan (Phase 1) Mouchel- November 2015

Shropshire Draft Parking Strategy Cabinet Report 12 July 2017

http://shropshire.gov.uk/committee-

services/documents/g3418/Public%20reports%20pack%2012th-Jul-

2017%2012.30%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10

Current Shropshire Parking Strategy Appendix A4 Parking Charge Structure.

https://shropshire.gov.uk/media/1360/parking-strategy-Appendix-a4-parking-charge-structure.pdf

Current Residents Parking Policy

https://shropshire.gov.uk/media/1359/parking-strategy-appendix-a1-residents-parking-policy.pdf

Shropshire Parking Strategy Framework - Part 1: Implementation of the linear model

### and associated elements

https://shropshire.gov.uk/committee-services/documents/b12014/Cabinet%20To%20Follow%201%2017th-Jan-2018%2012.30%20Cabinet.pdf?T=9

### **Cabinet Member (Portfolio Holder)**

Councillor Steven Davenport – Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport

### **Local Member**

County wide initiative – impacts on all local Members

### **Appendices**

- Appendix 1: Shropshire Council On –Street Residents Parking Policy Framework
- Appendix 2: On-street residents parking scheme requests and implementation priorities
- Appendix 3: Resident parking proposals presented within the public consultation questionnaire