

# REPORT TO THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Report No.8

Date of Meeting	13 <sup>th</sup> December 2007
Title of Report	<b>UPDATE ON THE INTRODUCTION OF RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES IN CHIPPENHAM</b>
Portfolio	Built Environment
Public Report	Yes

## Summary of Report

**To further update the committee of the current position in regard to Residents Parking Schemes in Chippenham.**

## Officer Recommendations

**That the committee note the report.**

Other than those implications agreed with the relevant Officers and referred to below, there are no other implications associated with this report.

Financial Implications	Legal Implications	Community & Environmental Implications	Human Resources Implications	Equality & Diversity Implications
NONE	YES	YES	YES	NONE

<b>Contact Officer</b>	Chris Major, Senior Parking Officer 01249 706285 <a href="mailto:cmajor@northwiltshire.gov.uk">cmajor@northwiltshire.gov.uk</a>
------------------------	--

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report is prepared by the Senior Parking Officer to update members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to the current position in regard to Residents Parking Schemes in Chippenham.

## 2. Options and Options Appraisal

- 2.1 Option 1: For the committee to note the report.

## 3. Background Information

- 3.1 At the Overview and Scrutiny meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> October a request was made for a more detailed report into the Residents Parking Schemes (RPS) that were currently undergoing consultation in Chippenham and the processes behind the implementation of a scheme.
- 3.2 In late 2006, the Car Park Working Group and the Portfolio Holder for Car Parks decided formally that Chippenham was the main area of need for RPS due to the number of requests received from members of the public including a petition from the Marshfield Road/Park Lane/St Pauls Street area. To progress and reduce the timeframes necessary to implement a RPS in North Wiltshire, NWDC asked RTA Associates to provide a report on the areas within Chippenham that requests for RPS had been received. This report formed part of the Parking Strategy due to go to the Executive Council 6<sup>th</sup> December 2007. The consultants report clearly highlights that any scheme in Chippenham would, at best, only have a 50-50 chance of success due to the restrictions of kerb space.
- 3.3 On the 16<sup>th</sup> August 2007, the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment and the Senior Parking Officer met with representatives from WCC to progress the first schemes in Chippenham. As the changes to implement RPS are significant WCC have agreed to make the implementation part of a Town Centre review of all parking restrictions to address long standing inconsistencies and make necessary improvements.
- 3.4 To implement a scheme a formal design must be produced, clearly showing the new restrictions or bays. This can take up to 12 weeks depending on resource available within the department at WCC who are responsible for the development of new schemes. Once developed the process moves onto the making of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). Prior to this formal process it is recommended that an informal consultation is held with the residents outlining the costs and restrictions of any scheme. This saves time and money if the majority of residents are against the scheme at the outset as the scheme can be abandoned at an earlier stage.
- 3.5 The TRO is the legal order upon the highway which allows the marking of restrictions and the enforcement of said markings. The procedures for making a TRO are laid down by the Secretary of State and must be observed strictly and are outlined below:
- i) ***Formal consultation is initially carried out with various statutory consultees including the Police, Fire Brigade, Ambulance Service, County Councillors, local Councillors and the County surveyor. Any objections received from the statutory consultees would have to be addressed and if the objections cannot be resolved then the scheme may have to be abandoned.***

- ii) *If no objections are received to the initial consultation, or if any are received and can be overcome, the proposed scheme is advertised for public comment for a period of three weeks.*
- iii) *If objections are received at either of these two stages then these must be considered by the relevant committee.*
- iv) *If there are no objections, or once the committee approves an amended scheme, the proposal can be implemented.*

The likely timescale for implementation of the proposal assuming there are no objections is approximately 26 weeks. If objections are received then the implementation can take near 40 weeks. The cost of this process is several thousand pounds. Once this process is complete the resource then has to be arranged with the Area Office to provide the Lining gang to mark upon the highway the new restrictions and signs. Until this has been completed no enforcement can be undertaken.

3.6 The area for the first zone (Appendix 1) was agreed based on a petition of over 200 signatures received by the Council and informal consultation was dispatched to all affected households within the proposed zone. This included all of the terms and conditions of the scheme such as the cost per permit and the limitations on numbers of permit per household but is outside of the process as set out above which would be started if the majority of the responses were returned indication approval for the scheme. By following this process the initial costs can be reduced, saving money if a scheme is not supported at an early stage. The form also clearly stated that if the form was not returned it would be classed as a no vote. NWDC have collated the responses to the scheme. Details of the responses are below.

	Marshfield Road	Parkfields	Fleet Road	Ricardo Road	Park Lane	St Paul Street	Springfield Buildings	Park Terrace
Sent	90	59	11	6	101	39	17	8
Returned	44	26	3	2	44	33	6	6
Y	28	6	0	1	26	26	3	4
N	10	18	3	1	12	6	2	2
N/A	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
No vote	5	2	0	0	5	1	1	0
% Returned	49	44	27	33	44	85	35	75
% YES overall	31.1	10.2	0.0	16.7	25.7	66.7	17.6	50.0
% NO overall	11.1	30.5	27.3	16.7	11.9	15.4	11.8	25.0
% N/A overall	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% No vote overall	5.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.6	5.9	0.0
% YES out of those returned	63.6	23.1	0.0	50.0	59.1	78.8	50.0	66.7
% NO out of those returned	22.7	69.2	100.0	50.0	27.3	18.2	33.3	33.3
% N/A out of those returned	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
% No vote out of those returned	11.4	7.7	0.0	0.0	11.4	3.0	16.7	0.0

3.7 Further to the poor level of response, the Lead Member and the Senior Parking Officer will be meeting with WCC on the 6<sup>th</sup> December to discuss the way forward. The clear rejection of the scheme from some areas of the zone may lead to the scheme being developed in a different form. However, the zone rejected by the public was developed based on the amount of kerb space necessary to accommodate the number of vehicles required to park. Therefore any change to the zone must be

considered carefully to ensure a high number of the residents who purchase permits can park on available kerb space.

- 3.8 The next scheme to be consulted upon will be a small scheme based on Hawthorn Road and Tugela Road Chippenham (Appendix 2). A large number of requests have been received highlighting a problem of commuter parking within the above named streets to the detriment of residents. Agreement has been given by WCC to consult on this scheme and the consultation questionnaire will go to all households in the early part of the New Year.
- 3.9 One the informal consultation has been completed and a majority of residents are in agreement with the plan a formal scheme will be designed. At this point a report will be submitted to the Executive. The report will clearly state all costs and the capital repayment period of the scheme. If agreement is granted the formal consultation will commence.

#### **4. Human Resource Implications**

- 4.1 The issue and monitor of Residents Parking Schemes is labour intensive when the schemes first start and at the renewal dates. All application must be checked to ensure the applicant fulfils all criteria and is allowed a permit. All documents must be scanned into the system and indexed against the application. Within the suggested zones it is anticipated that there is in the region of 500 properties and 500 vehicles that will be eligible to apply. However, all work will be undertaken by the existing staff within the Parking Services department.

#### **5. Equality and Diversity Implications**

- 5.1 All Disabled Driver Blue Badge holders who are residents within the zone are eligible for a permit within the scheme upon payment of the required fee.
- 5.2 Blue badge holders who are non-residents would be permitted to park in a RPS on yellow line restrictions under the national regulations and concessions for legitimate badge holders. It may be necessary to consider whether any further concessions would be appropriate e.g. within the 'permit holders only bays' themselves with or without time limit, to reduce the possibility of vehicles being parked obstructively on other restrictions at junctions etc.

#### **6. Community and Environmental Implications**

- 6.1 Although there is no requirement for the Council to provide parking for any member of the public, within central areas where there is a lack of off street parking facilities if appropriate the Council may investigate the development of Resident Parking Schemes. This could be classed by members of the public who do not live within the zone to be a benefit to the resident within the zone and can lead to negative publicity. Therefore it must be made clear in publicity that all costs associated with the scheme will be paid by the residents of the zone.

#### **7. Legal implications**

- 7.1 All vehicles within the zone who wish to be allocated a permit must provide proof of vehicle ownership and residency. This can lead to a reduction of unregistered vehicles on the road.

**8. Financial Implications**

8.1 The schemes are designed to be self funding. All capital costs will be repaid in less than 5 years.

**9. Risk Analysis**

9.1 There are no specific risks associated with the introduction of Resident Parking Schemes beyond those highlighted above.

<b>Appendices:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Resident Zone 1 (Marshfield Road)</li> <li>2. Resident Zone 2 (Tugela Road)</li> </ol>
<b>Background Documents Used in the Preparation of this Report:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking Strategy Phase 1- Residents Parking</li> </ul>

**Previous Decisions Connected with this Report**

Report	Committee & Date	Minute Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>		