

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT – CLLR PHILLIP WHITEHEAD**

### **HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SERVICE**

**OFFICER CONTACT:** Joanne Heal 01225 713276 email: [joanne.heal@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:joanne.heal@wiltshire.gov.uk)

**REFERENCE:** HT- 19 - 16

---

### **WAITING AND PARKING RESTRICTION REVIEWS**

#### **Purpose of Report**

1. Wiltshire Council receives a high volume of requests for parking restrictions every year. In order to manage this demand in August 2011 a new procedure was developed and agreed which involved the initial requests being managed by the Town and Parish Councils and submission on an annual basis to the Network Managers Team. On receipt of the annual submissions, officers would assess each individual request against a scoring matrix in order to determine a priority of order for progression. These were then reported to the Cabinet Member for approval and a number of schemes (dependent on funding and staff resources) were agreed for progression.
2. Since the introduction of this process, there have been a number of staff changes in the Network Manager's team and the impact of the voluntary redundancy programme has meant a reduction in the staffing resources and high staff turnover has heavily impacted on the ability of the team to deliver the parking reviews. There is now a considerable backlog of outstanding requests from Town and Parish Councils. In addition to the staff resource issues, the funding available for this type of work has been reduced.
3. In order to be able manage this backlog it is proposed to change the way requests are assessed. This report sets out the current programme, the outstanding areas for review, outlines the proposed way forward and identifies the priority list for the next few years.

#### **Relevance to the Council's Business Plan**

4. The progression and delivery of waiting restriction reviews meets key priorities of the Council's Business Plan, community lead approach to designing and delivering schemes, working with the Towns and Parish Councils to solve local parking issues. The restrictions will help protect vulnerable road users and will support the local businesses by ensuring appropriate parking arrangements.

#### **General**

5. On average the Council receives over 100 written requests for either new waiting / parking restrictions or changes to existing controls each year.
6. Due to the extensive legal process involved in introducing Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs), even the simplest scheme can take around six months from initial consultation to implementation. On a larger scale review, this can extend to over a year, due in part to the level of consultation involved in developing an acceptable scheme. It is therefore proposed that any programme only identifies the date on which scheme design

commences and it should be noted that implementation could roll over to the following financial year.

7. The progression of reviews needs to involve an assessment process to ensure that priority is given to appropriate schemes. This report sets out a proposed process for responding to and assessing requests for waiting restriction reviews and to agree how schemes will be prioritised for implementation.
8. The existing scoring matrix assessment process is very detailed, time consuming and is considered overly complex. As such it needs to be revised.

### **Current Programme of works**

9. Resources are currently committed to implementing parking restriction reviews in the following areas:

Chippenham and Chippenham Without  
Royal Wootton Bassett  
West Wiltshire Parishes

10. Community Area Transport Groups (CATG's) are also working on comprehensive reviews for:

Amesbury  
Mere  
Trowbridge

11. All requests for Salisbury City are managed by the Traffic Engineering Team and are outside the scope of this report.

### **Outstanding areas for review**

12. The Network Management team has received requests for changing to parking restrictions from the following areas:

- Bradford on Avon
- Box - North Wilts parishes TRO
- Chippenham
- Colerne – North Wilts parishes TRO
- Corsham
- Cricklade
- Devizes
- Hilmarton - North Wilts parishes TRO
- Lydiard Millicent - North Wilts parishes TRO
- Lyneham & Bradenstoke - North Wilts parishes TRO
- Malmesbury
- Market Lavington – Kennet Parishes TRO
- Melksham and Melksham Without
- Purton - North Wilts parishes TRO
- Roundway - Kennet parishes TRO
- Rowde - Kennet parishes TRO
- Seend - Kennet parishes TRO
- Sherston - North Wilts parishes TRO
- Tidworth
- Tisbury
- Warminster

13. All parish council waiting restrictions are grouped and managed under the former district council areas for the TROs (with the current exception of Salisbury area) therefore all parish requests within that area would be considered at the same time.
14. Taking the above into account, this means that there are 12 outstanding Town/Parish area reviews. Given the available resources within the Network Managers Team, it is envisaged that up to 5 reviews could be managed per year. On this basis it would take three years to complete the current outstanding list of requests.
15. A full list of all outstanding requests is attached at **Appendix 1** to this report.

## **Proposed Approach**

### Process

16. All initial requests for waiting and parking restrictions will continue to be directed to the Town and Parish Councils.
17. Towns/Parishes to send out standard request form WR1 to applicant (see **Appendix 2 to this report**).
18. Town/Parish to complete assessment form WR2 (see **Appendix 3 to this report**) giving additional information and validation to resident's requests and send into Network Management team by the end of January each year, together with WR1's received.
19. Concerns relating to obstruction of access for emergency vehicles should be forwarded to the Network Management Team for further assessment with immediacy and are not required to wait for the Town/Parish Council annual submission.
20. All requests will then be assessed and scored against a revised criteria taking factors into account such as:
  - Duration since last review
  - Access and obstruction of Emergency and Refuse collection vehicles
  - Parking in contravention of the Highway Code
  - Restricted visibility
  - Obstruction of private access/driveway
  - If existing restrictions are in the area
  - Number of requests for the same restriction
  - Consideration is also given to the street environment and existing speed limit
21. These scores will then be collated per Town/Parish and reported to the Cabinet Member on an annual basis for agreement on which schemes to progress. The decision on how many schemes can be progressed will be resource dependant. It is envisaged that five schemes per year could be progressed internally.
22. To allow additional flexibility for locations that the Town/Parish Councils consider to be a priority in advance of a full review, or those that are not collectively scored as a priority for progression, the option is available to progress these in isolation through the CATG's. However, this approach will need to be treated with caution as it should not be seen as a way of bypassing the full review process and should only be used for limited locations. Funding for this option would be at the discretion of the CATG who are likely to seek contribution, in whole or in part, from the relevant Town or Parish Council.

### **Scoring Assement of outstanding requests**

23. All outstanding requests have been scored against the revised criteria , the results of which are shown below in order of highest total score:

<b>Orders</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
Corsham	541
North Parishes (13)	356
Malmesbury	315
Warminster	306.5
Bradford-on-Avon	293.5
Kennet Parishes (6)	272.5
Tisbury	178
Tidworth	126.5
Melksham	118.5
Cricklade	85.5
Devizes	56.5
Chippenham	31.5

24. Based on the scoring above, it is recommended that the top five schemes are agreed for progression this financial year, i.e. Corsham, North Parishes, Malmesbury, Warminster and Bradford on Avon.
25. The remaining areas will be progressed as soon as practicably possible but it is likely to be April 2017 before the next five areas can be commenced.

### **Main Considerations for the Council**

26. Due to the large demand for changes to waiting and parking restrictions and the limited staffing resources available, consideration needs to be given to an appropriate methodology for assessing and prioritising requests to ensure that staffing and financial resources are appropriately allocated.

### **Background**

27. Due to the staffing issues within the Network Management Team and the resultant revised priorities, it has not been possible to progress the waiting restriction reviews using the existing complex matrix assessment on an annual basis for the last few years. This has resulted in a backlog of requests. The revised process outlined within this report aims to streamline the assessment of requests to enable comprehensive programme of reviews to manage this backlog. All outstanding requests have been assessed against this new process to develop a priority progression list as detailed in paragraph 23 above.

### **Overview and Scrutiny Engagement**

28. None

### **Safeguarding Implications**

29. There is no risk to the Council as a result of these proposals

### **Public Health Implications**

30. There are none in this proposal

### **Procurement Implications**

31. There are none in this proposal

### **Equalities Impact of the Proposal**

32. None.

### **Environmental and Climate Change Considerations**

33. The introduction of new parking controls will involve the laying of lines and installation of signs where necessary. This will have an impact on the visual aspect of the highway but has to be balanced against the need to ensure appropriate traffic management controls are in place.

### **Risk Assessment**

34.

<b>Risks of not carrying out proposals</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Continued inconsistency in prioritisation of parking controls across the county</li><li>Schemes being introduced on ad hoc basis dependant on demand as opposed to need.</li><li>Staffing and financial resources being fully occupied on demand led schemes with the potential for more appropriate traffic management schemes not to be progressed</li><li></li></ul>	
<b>Risks of proposals</b>	<b>Mitigation of risks</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Potential for matrix assessment not to support progression of a scheme with a unique demand</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some flexibility has been built into the scoring to enable other factors to be taken into consideration.</li></ul>

### **Financial Implications**

35. The number of schemes to be progressed on an annual basis will be dependent on the size of the individual schemes. Assessing all requests against known criteria will improve transparency of decision making and ensure that the Council's financial resources are suitable allocated.

### **Legal Implications**

36. All changes to existing parking and waiting restrictions require amendments to the TRO. The process is governed by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and associated Procedural Regulations. Failure to adhere to the statutory processes could result in the restrictions being successfully challenged in the High Court.

### **Options Considered**

37. To:

- (i) Agree the proposals and scheme priority recommended in paragraph 23 of this report.
- (ii) Not to agree the proposals and to request a further review of the scoring process for outstanding requests to be investigated and reported back to the Cabinet Member.

### **Reasons for Proposal**

38. It is considered that adoption of the revised scoring guide, together with the added flexibility set out in paragraph 22, will allow the Council to better manage the demand for changes to waiting restrictions given the resources available. The continued engagement and involvement of the Town and Parish Councils in the process will ensure that only those requests with overall community support are taken forward.

### **Proposal**

39. That the proposals to manage the outstanding waiting restriction requests outlined in this report, and the priority for progression identified under paragraph 23, be adopted.

---

**The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this Report:**

None