

## **RESIDENT PARKING SCRUTINY REVIEW**

*A report produced by*  
**THE BUSINESS OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

*July 2017*  
**FINAL REPORT**

**WIRRAL BOROUGH COUNCIL**

***RESIDENT PARKING***

**SCRUTINY REVIEW**

**FINAL REPORT**

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>MEMBERS OF THE TASK &amp; FINISH REVIEW PANEL .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY FOR THE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF RESIDENT PARKING.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>18</b>

**Appendix 1: SCOPING DOCUMENT**

**Appendix 2: RESIDENT PARKING POLICY CRITERIA**

**Appendix 3: BACKGROUND RESEARCH - LOCAL AUTHORITY SCHEMES**

**Appendix 4: PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

At the meeting of the Business Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016, a report was presented to the Committee around the Council's Resident Parking Policy. Following acknowledgement by officers and Members that there were a number of issues relating to the policy and the implementation of resident parking schemes in Wirral, the Committee agreed to undertake a Task & Finish scrutiny review.

A Task & Finish Review Panel comprising three Members was agreed and a series of evidence sessions with relevant senior officers was held.

An Executive Summary of the findings follows, together with the recommendations arising from this Review. The Report then sets the methodology adopted for gathering the evidence. This is followed by the main body of the report which details the key findings of the review and the conclusions and recommendations of the Review Panel.

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The implementation of resident parking schemes by councils can be an appropriate response to address issues where residents are unable to park outside or close to their homes. Normally, these would be considered if specific traffic / parking issues exist or the requirements defined in relevant policies are met. Wirral Council's Resident Parking Policy has been in place since 2007 and no review has been undertaken since then to determine if it remains fit for purpose.

In undertaking this scrutiny review, a number of issues relating to resident parking in Wirral since the policy was approved by Cabinet were discussed by the Review Panel and officers involved in the review. These are explored in more detail in the main body of the report.

The current policy criteria were put in place as a response to the high volume of resident parking applications received prior to 2007. This resulted in a moratorium on new applications due to the level of resource required to assess and administer applications. However, since the new policy was approved, only three schemes have been introduced as a result of the restrictive criteria. Additionally, for the Council to demonstrate that each policy criterion has been demonstrated requires significant resources.

The current permit fee of £10 is only applied to new schemes introduced since 2007. All schemes implemented prior to 2007 received permits for free, as per the policy at that time. The permit fee has not been updated to reflect increasing maintenance and the cost to provide ongoing reviews of schemes. These historic schemes do not currently contribute to these costs and ongoing maintenance cannot be provided unless there is a major road safety issue that requires attention. However, this would be funded through other revenue budgets. The Review Panel considers that all residents benefitting from resident parking schemes should contribute to this cost to ensure that the system is equitable and sustainable.

In undertaking this scrutiny review, the Review Panel noted the relevant policies across other local authorities and also considered some of the issues raised by a number of residents invited to speak to Members as part of the review. With the support of officers, the Review Panel has made a number of recommendations to address resident parking issues across Wirral. This includes proposing an updated Resident Parking Policy.

### **Recommendation 1**

It is recommended that:

- i) The Resident Parking Policy is updated to reflect the proposed amendments to the existing criteria and the inclusion of a policy statement allowing discretionary consideration of applications where all parts of the criteria are not complied with as detailed in **Appendix 4** to this report;
- ii) A full review of the amended policy is carried out after the first two years of operation with a report back to the relevant Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the findings of that review and any other recommendations arising.

**Recommendation 2**

It is recommended that applications for resident parking schemes should be accompanied by a non-refundable application fee to cover the cost of the initial investigation only. It is recommended that this fee is discounted from the introduction fee applied to successful applications.

**Recommendation 3**

Officers should review all issues relating to visitor passes to properties included within a resident parking scheme, including how these are issued and the number of passes per property, giving due regard to issues of effectiveness, cost and resources to administer.

**Recommendation 4**

It is recommended that officers are provided with delegated powers to review and update the level of permit fee for resident parking schemes on an annual basis as part of the annual fees and charges review process; taking into account the cost of administration, maintenance and periodic reviews of the schemes to ensure they remain fit for purpose.

**Recommendation 5**

It is recommended that officers are instructed to commence the necessary legal processes to amend all historic resident parking schemes in order to implement permit fees.

### 3. MEMBERS OF THE TASK & FINISH REVIEW PANEL

**Councillor Jean Stapleton (Chair)**



#### CHAIR'S PERSONAL STATEMENT

*"As requests for residents' parking have increased in recent years, Members of the Business Overview & Scrutiny Committee generally agreed that the current policy was not fit for purpose and should be reviewed and a Scrutiny Review Panel should look at all the issues."*

*"This report makes it clear that the provision of resident parking must be sustainable and equitable to all residents of Wirral. It is important that the Resident Parking Policy is fit for purpose whilst also recognising the demand for resident parking schemes as well as the need to ensure they are properly maintained and reviewed. This report proposes a set of recommendations which we believe helps address these issues."*

*I would like to thank the other Members of the Scrutiny Review Panel in undertaking this review. I would also like to extend my thanks to the officers for their support and to the residents that attended an evidence session to discuss particular issues."*

Other Panel Members were:

**Councillor Chris Blakely**



**Councillor Dave Mitchell**



## **4. ORIGINALSCOPE AND METHODOLOGY**

### **4.1 Scope**

A scoping meeting was convened with senior Council officers and the agreed scoping document is included as Appendix 1 to this report.

### **4.2 Methodology**

The scrutiny review was informed through a number of question and answer evidence sessions with Council officers. These included:

- The Traffic Network Manager
- The Parking Manager
- The Highways Asset Manager

In order for the Review panel to further understand the issues relating to resident parking, a small number of residents were invited to attend an evidence session to discuss particular issues relating to their respective street.

The Review Panel also considered other policies in place across a number of other local authorities, giving due regard to their eligibility criteria and charges that are applied.

## 5. OVERVIEW OF RESIDENT PARKING

Residents parking schemes are a form of controlled parking scheme or zone where parking in a street or area is controlled in order to help residents park their vehicles. They are generally provided in areas where parked vehicles not belonging to residents are making this difficult. Resident parking schemes fall under the Road Traffic Regulations Act as one of the road regulations which can be introduced by Councils. Others include double yellow lines, waiting times and weight limits.

Although there is no legal requirement to have resident parking schemes, Councils have road safety duties to reduce accidents and reduce congestion. The Road Traffic Regulations Act says that in certain circumstances, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) can be introduced. One of these is 'local amenity' so most residential schemes will fall under this which provides the legal basis to introduce a scheme. Once it has been decided to introduce a TRO, the current legal procedure Wirral Council adheres to is as follows:

- Carry out a consultation as per Council's TRO procedures, setting out the requirement for consultation which includes notices on site, local press notification and other consultations officers feel is needed in respect to the scale and impact of the TRO.
- Allow 21 days to object and then to consider objections.
- Decide whether to implement the TRO (whether in total, in part or an amended version) once objections have been considered.
- Through delegated authority, if there are any outstanding objections, officers will report to the relevant Cabinet for approval or to the Highways and Traffic Representation Panel, depending on the number of objections.

### Advantages and disadvantages of Resident Parking Schemes

In undertaking the scrutiny review of Wirral's existing Resident Parking Policy, the Review Panel acknowledged that there are both advantages and disadvantages of implementing resident parking schemes. A summary of the advantages include:

- Discouraging commuter shopper/business parking in residential streets
- On-street parking is easier and more convenient for residents
- Parking and traffic management can be significantly improved
- There may be road safety benefits
- Enhanced environment in residential areas

However, a number of disadvantages are highlighted. These are:

- The possible knock-on effect of relocated commuter/shopper/business parking
- The cost of introduction, management and charges for permits
- Permits not guaranteeing a parking space



## 6. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

### 6.1 Wirral Council's Resident Parking Policy

Wirral Council's Resident Parking Policy has been in place following Cabinet approval in 2007 and introduced more stringent criteria for a resident parking scheme to be introduced. The policy is attached as **Appendix 2** to this report.

Prior to 2007, it is understood that up to ten applications were being received by the Council per month for a resident parking scheme to be implemented. A database of approximately 370 streets and areas which had formally made a request for a scheme to be implemented was maintained. However, Members were informed that the resources were not available to process these applications and a moratorium was put into place until the new policy, including criteria, was introduced in 2007. In addition, for new schemes, the policy also introduced an annual charge of £10 per permit for each vehicle applied for at a property. Permits issued to schemes implemented prior to 2007 continue to be free of charge. This policy has not been subject to any further review since being implemented.

Officers explained that the impact of the new criteria has resulted in a reduction in requests being made to be around four per month but none of these have met the requirements of the criteria. The issues in relation to the policy criteria are detailed later in this report. At the time of the scrutiny review being undertaken, only three schemes have been introduced since 2007. These have been awarded outside of the current policy requirements with approximately 345 permits having been issued. These schemes are:

- **Manor Lane in Liscard** – A small scheme of nine properties opposite a primary school which was introduced in conjunction with other traffic management as a road safety measure to reduce vehicle movements in the vicinity of the school. This scheme was financed by the residents and the school.
- **Heath Drive in Heswall** – A scheme of fourteen properties adjacent to Heswall Medical Centre. The scheme was introduced as a road safety measure in relation to a planning condition attached to a development proposal to expand the Medical Centre. This scheme was financed by the Medical Centre developer.
- **Virginia Road in New Brighton** - A large scheme of about 280 properties introduced as part of highway improvements in New Brighton (including resurfacing of Marine Promenade), following public consultation on the proposed improvements. The scheme was financed through the capital programme for the highway improvements.

### 6.2 Historic Resident Parking Schemes

There are eight historic schemes in place across Wirral that were implemented prior to Cabinet approving the existing policy in 2007. These are:

- Clifton Park, Birkenhead
- Tranmere Rovers
- Prenton (Woodchurch Road)
- Woodchurch (Arrowe Park)
- Silverburn Avenue, Moreton
- Barnston lane, Moreton
- Liscard
- Karlake Road, Poulton

Within these schemes, it is estimated that there are between ten to fourteen thousand permits in circulation. The exact number of permits is unknown as these were recorded on a bespoke IT system which ran for approximately twenty years unsupported. It is understood that this system is no longer operational and the information held on it was unable to be recovered.

These permits were issued free of charge as per the policy when the schemes were awarded. Permits are linked to the permit holder's vehicle but most of the historic permits were issued without any expiration date. All live permits are now issued on the Council's debt management system and these can be monitored and reviewed as they have expiration dates of 2-3 years. As residents request new permits due to a change of vehicle or new home ownership, the debt management system will be updated accordingly. However, with the vast majority of these historic schemes, there is a potential risk to the Council that use of the permits could be abused.

A resident parking scheme around Tranmere Rovers Football Club has also been implemented. Visitor parking permits are administered and issued by the Tranmere Rovers Residents Association and the scheme's restrictions were established based on the time and days when matches were being played. The restrictions in place are in force from **August** to **May** each year. The days and hours where restrictions are in place are detailed below:

**Monday, Tuesday and Friday**

5:30pm to 10pm

**Saturday**

11:30am to 6:00pm

A number of other events such as live music shows, circus shows and car boot sales are also held regularly at Tranmere Rovers ground leading to increased parking on nearby roads during other times.

The Review Panel agreed with officers that this existing scheme is not fit for purpose as the restrictions on the scheme are no longer consistent with the current scheduling of football matches and additional events. It is understood that displacement of vehicles parking on nearby roads is also an issue as drivers are complying with the restrictions whether there is a match being played or not. There are also issues with missing signs resulting in the inability to enforce parking restrictions. As there is no financial resource, Members were informed that the Council is unable to undertake a review of the scheme to make it fit for purpose and to ensure ongoing maintenance is provided.

### 6.3 Compliance with resident parking criteria

For any resident parking scheme to be considered, each criterion detailed in the policy (**Appendix 2**) is required to be met. The Review Panel learnt that following the approval of the policy in 2007, the criteria has resulted in difficulties for the Council to demonstrate compliance with the various thresholds due to the associated costs and resources it requires. Additionally, residents who believe they have justifiable reasons for a resident parking scheme to be implemented are unable to meet the criteria. This is evidenced by the lack of any schemes being implemented since the introduction of the current policy.

As part of the scrutiny review, the Review Panel identified a number of streets in Wirral where there are known resident parking issues that have been brought to the attention of the Council. A resident representing each road was invited to speak to the Review Panel to help inform Members' understanding of the unique issues they faced and, in particular, the difficulties of implementing a resident parking scheme.

A summary of the key issues raised by the residents in relation to resident parking within their respective roads are highlighted below:

- The close proximity of one street to a commercial town centre is an issue. There is a free car park located within the street but once full, cars will park in the nearest available space within the street to the detriment of residents.
- There is an issue with vehicles being parked by staff from local businesses.
- Vehicles are often parked close together over the kerb resulting in residents having difficulty accessing / leaving their property.
- Despite double yellow lines leading into one street, there is an issue with delivery lorries often parking around them. This results in the entrance becoming extremely narrow and limits access to it. Delivery lorries also park further down the road impacting residents being able to park.
- Waste collection trucks are unable to access one of the roads at times. When access is attempted, there is a risk of damage to parked vehicles.
- Resident parking has worsened due to the introduction of parking charges at a nearby privately owned off street car park, displacing vehicles to the street.
- Although two of the streets represented by residents at the evidence session have fewer properties than is required to comply with the existing policy (currently 300), a resident expressed the willingness of all residents within their street to pay the costs for implementation of a scheme due to the severity of their resident parking issues.
- A resident highlighted that his street is currently going through the approval and consultation process for a resident parking scheme following agreement by the Constituency Committee to fund it. Issues raised were-
  - The increase in shoppers parking in the street as a result of no parking restrictions being put in place and the displacement of parking from a nearby street where there are parking restrictions.
  - The impact on street cleaning vehicles which are unable to gain access to the street due to excessive non-resident parking.
  - The effort required to achieve 80% support for the scheme as the street has approximately 170 properties. There was a requirement for extensive door knocking through a team of volunteers and convincing those with cars who were considered more reluctant to agreeing to a scheme was challenging.

The residents invited to the evidence session collectively expressed frustration that the current policy is too restrictive to be able to apply for a resident parking scheme. Although the Review Panel does not give an opinion on whether the examples of parking issues identified during the review warranted a scheme to be implemented, it highlighted that there could be a number of streets within Wirral where a resident parking scheme may be appropriate, even though all the prescriptive policy criteria are not met.

The Review Panel and the residents who attended the evidence session support the view that Wirral Council's policy could incorporate an appropriate caveat that allows discretion by officers, and possibly through consultation with ward members and the relevant Cabinet Member, to consider those applications where there are significant issues identified, but not all policy criteria are met.

The issues raised by the residents were acknowledged by officers. From a Council perspective, officers confirmed that the main barriers to implementing a resident parking scheme has been for residents to comply with three specific requirements of the criteria stated within the policy (**Appendix 2**). In order of severity, these are:

- Minimum requirement for three hundred properties within the proposed scheme (Policy Criterion h);
- The requirement for 80% support for the scheme from residents (Policy Criterion f); and
- The available kerb space that is occupied in a street (Policy Criterion a).

#### 6.4 Resident Parking Schemes operated by other Local Authorities

The Review Panel considered other resident parking policies in operation throughout other local authorities, excluding larger cities as these were considered to have different parking issues compared to those faced by Wirral. In Particular, Members were interested in the eligibility criteria or specific requirements for a scheme to be established. A summary of the feedback received from contacted local authorities is attached as **Appendix 3**.

The Review Panel and officers recognized that there will be differing demands for resident parking across all local authorities as well as a need to address unique issues. However, in comparison with the information obtained from other local authorities on their policies, Wirral Council does share a number of common themes in respect to the circumstances in which a resident parking scheme will be implemented. These include:

- A requirement for a majority of households to agree / participate in a scheme;
- The impact on the commercial viability of an area; and
- Residents not having access to off-street parking.

The Review Panel and officers note that both Cheshire West and Chester Council and Flintshire County Council have statements incorporated into their policies which allows consideration of wider traffic management and safety issues should all aspects of their respective criteria not be met. These are clearly defined. As highlighted earlier in this report, Wirral Council does not have any policy to allow any discretionary consideration of resident parking applications made in instances where all criteria has not been met.

#### 6.5 Review of Resident Parking Criteria

The Review Panel and officers considered Wirral Council's current policy criteria (**Appendix 2**) which are all required to be complied with for a scheme to be awarded.

##### **Policy Criteria a:**

*“Not less than 85% of the available kerbside space is occupied for more than six hours between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on five or more days a week from Monday to Saturday, and a bona fide need of residents is established. At least 50% of the 85% occupied kerbside space must be non-residents. This is to ensure that before a scheme is considered, it is shown that the existing spaces are heavily used by non-residents and difficulty is experienced in finding a space on most days of the week.”*

The Review Panel understands that the requirement to demonstrate compliance with this criterion is resource intensive in terms of staff time and requires prolonged monitoring. There is a requirement to carry out a sufficient number of parking surveys each day over five (or more) days to establish whether the 85% threshold of occupied kerbside space is exceeded for more than six hours on each of those days. In addition, the 50% threshold of non-residential parking is difficult or impossible to evidence without tracing vehicle ownership. The Review Panel also considered that this criterion was overly complicated. It is proposed that this criterion is evidenced through a form of observations or indications testing which would be more efficient as well as speaking to residents to identify when the worst days / times are.

**Policy Criteria b:**

*“Not more than 50% of the car-owning residents have or could have parking available within the curtilage of their property or within 200 metres walking distance by way of rented garages or other off-street space.”*

It is proposed this criterion should be diluted to remove checks carried out as to whether properties could have parking within 200 metres walking distance by way of rented garages or other off-street space. This criterion is difficult for officers to demonstrate compliance as identifying which residents have a private garage relies on personal information not available to the Council. This was supported by the Review Panel. As with the first criterion, it is resource intensive to demonstrate compliance.

**Policy Criteria c:**

*“The normal daily demand for resident spaces can be met.”*

The criteria requirement that the normal daily demand for resident spaces can be met is difficult to apply. This is due to a need to determine what the normal demand is and this could only be undertaken through consultation with residents. However, it was agreed that this should be kept as it is consistent with other local authorities.

**Policy Criteria d:**

*“The introduction of the scheme will not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.”*

It is proposed to retain this criterion as it does provide an element of discretion to officers in consideration of displaced parking issues.

**Policy Criteria e:**

*“The scheme is acceptable both to the Police and the operations of the emergency services.”*

The review Panel and officers recognize the importance of the Police and emergency services and propose that this remains within the policy as it is built into the current consultation process for approving a scheme.

**Policy Criteria f:**

*“The proposals are acceptable to the majority of the residents. There must be a minimum of 80% support for the scheme from all residential properties within the scheme boundary (including nil returns). This is to ensure majority support from residents for the introduction of a scheme. Properties within the scheme boundary (including nil returns). This is to ensure majority support from residents for the introduction of a scheme.”*

It is proposed to retain this criterion in its current form. It is suggested that the requirement for 80% support for a scheme may be set at the right level as reducing it may increase the risk of more objections being raised through the legal process. As detailed earlier in the report, the evidence session with residents discussing resident parking issues highlighted the effort required to achieve 80% support. If this was to be increased, there is a risk of residents not being able demonstrate compliance.

### **Policy Criteria g.**

*“In areas where parking space is severely limited, the introduction of reserved parking does not seriously affect the commercial viability of the area.”*

The Review Panel supports this criterion due to the importance of ensuring shops do not close and to ensure footfall can be built up where necessary. It is important that the Council continues to manage this as part of the decision making for a scheme.

### **Policy Criteria h.**

*“There must normally be a minimum of 300 residential properties within the proposed scheme. For schemes of less than 300 residential properties, there must be other waiting restrictions in the immediate vicinity.”*

Although the Review Panel initially suggested consideration to reducing the minimum number of properties required within a scheme, it was argued by officers that a higher number would allow more properties within a scheme and that smaller schemes will simply displace parking further up the road, resulting in complaints from those affected.

Officers support the existing 300 minimum properties requirement within the policy but propose, with support from the Review Panel, that a clearly defined policy to allow officers to give consideration to waiving certain aspects of the criteria, and not just for the minimum number of properties. This is in recognition of the need to consider and understand all issues relating to resident parking. Officers referenced aspects of Cheshire West's and Flintshire County Council's respective policies allowing a discretionary decision to be made where schemes do not meet the criteria.

Additionally, whilst acknowledging that there is a high demand for parking schemes, softening the criteria may result in the risk that the Council may be inundated with applications that cannot be processed due to resource limitations.

The Review Panel was also reassured by officers that the introduction of any on-street parking charges which could impact resident parking through displacement would be managed through an existing mechanism in place to address the issue. Key council officers would have input into this for resident parking schemes to be introduced following discussions with residents. When Pay & Display was introduced in Liscard, resident parking schemes gradually grew through the impact on adjacent streets so the problem is known.

## **6.6 Administration and financing of resident parking schemes**

The Review Panel was informed that staffing resources to investigate and implement resident parking schemes has reduced significantly due to the financial pressures facing the council. As a result, all new resident parking schemes have to be self-financing.

Following assessment and approval of any resident parking scheme application that meets the criteria, residents are required to pay for the set-up of the scheme. The charge for this is dependent on the number of properties within the scheme but is estimated to be around £70 to £100 per property. This one-off charge covers the following costs:

- Initial discussions with residents and others to develop a suitable proposal.
- Consultation, including advertisement fees, drawing up plans and schedules and dealing with objections.

- Providing and installing local infrastructure, including signage and road markings to comply with legislation (Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions).

However, the Review Panel notes that the cost to carry out the initial review of an application to determine whether the criteria has been met would only be recovered through the one-off charge if an application has been successful. The staff time to undertake an initial review of an application is approximately three hours.

Following implementation of a scheme, there is currently an annual fee of £10 for each permit issued as agreed by Cabinet in 2007. This fee has not been reviewed since it was introduced in 2007 and therefore is no longer consistent with the associated costs to reviewing schemes, issuing permits and to provide ongoing maintenance to signage and line markings. The Review Panel was informed that the £10 permit fee was initially established to promote the understanding that resident parking is privilege.

Officers explained that as all historic resident parking schemes (those implemented prior to 2007) are not required to pay an annual permit fee, ongoing maintenance cannot be provided. Exceptions to this would be if a major road safety issue needs addressing and the Council would be duty bound to do so but costs would be met through revenue budgets using existing staff resources. The Review Panel notes that if these historic schemes continue to receive permits for free (current estimation of up to 14K), this will potentially put a greater strain on departmental resources. Additionally, and as highlighted earlier, the Review Panel was also informed that any influx of applications for a scheme would adversely impact the ability to process the requests against other Council priorities.

Residents receive 1 visitor permit per property and this has not changed since the introduction of the new policy in 2007. Temporary permits can also be applied for which would cover carers, doctors, trades etc. From research carried out on other authorities there are alternatives, such as the provision of scratch cards at a cost to the residents.

#### Ongoing maintenance costs

Officers provided data to highlight the cost to the Council of providing ongoing maintenance for new schemes as well as the cost if ongoing maintenance was to be undertaken for historic schemes.

Based on the projected cost of maintenance of the signs and lines for an average scheme and the number of permits per property on issue in an average scheme, the cost per permit for ongoing maintenance at current contract rates is calculated as **£4.80** per year. This calculation is based on:

- An average scheme of **500** properties and the cost of the necessary signs and lines for these costing approximately **£12,000**.
- Replacing and renewing signs and lines at five year intervals on average, allowing for fading, vandalism, damage, etc.
- An average scheme having approximately **one permit** (on average) issued to each property)

Therefore, the average cost per year to maintain signs and lines in an average scheme is **£2,400** (£12,000 / 5 years). This equates to **£4.80** per permit per year (£2,400 / 500 permits).

Smaller schemes would cost less to maintain, but would have a smaller number of permits issued and larger schemes would cost more to maintain but would have a greater number of permits, hence the calculation of £4.80 would remain a valid approximation regardless of the size of scheme.

It is also understood that the cost to produce a permit, on average, is approximately £15. This is based on IT systems, permit paper, staffing administration and postage. Additionally, officers added that up to £3 per permit would be needed to allow funds to be built up to ensure on-going reviews can be carried out on a periodic basis.

The costings detailed above demonstrate a need for the Council to review the charges it applies for permits. This includes the impact of not charging permit holders for schemes introduced prior to 2007 (historic schemes), including the scheme in place for Tranmere Rovers, has on Council resources and the ability to provide appropriate on-going maintenance and appropriate reviews..

From analysis of permit charges applied across other sampled local authorities (See Fig 1), the Review Panel notes that Wirral Council's annual charge of £10 is significantly less. It is also noted that a number of their policies rationalise these charges on the basis of administering, maintaining and enforcing their resident parking schemes.

**Fig 1. Local Authority Permit Fee Charges**

<b>Derbyshire</b>	Resident's first permit - <b>£35 per year</b> Resident's second permit (or subsequent permit, dependent upon the scheme) - <b>£50 per year</b>
<b>Sefton</b>	<b>£30</b> per permit (One permit per vehicle) Permits are valid for two years. Renewals are free. (Note: Current moratorium on any new schemes).
<b>Hyndburn</b>	<b>£25</b> per permit per year
<b>Preston</b>	Resident's first permit: <b>£29.00</b> Second permit: <b>£45.00</b>
<b>Cheshire West &amp; Chester</b>	<b>£60</b> per permit.
<b>St Helens</b>	St Helens does not charge for any form of parking permits. There is a <b>£15</b> fee for replacement if lost, stolen or damaged.
<b>Flintshire</b>	<b>£25</b> per year per permit
<b>South Gloucestershire</b>	<b>£30</b> per year for the first permit <b>£60</b> per year for the second permit
<b>Tameside</b>	<b>£30</b> per year per permit



### Parking Enforcement

Parking enforcement is carried out by the Council's contractor who deploys between 10 to 12 Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) on a daily basis. The CEOs patrol the whole of the Borough and include visits to the resident only parking zones as part of a beat patrol. Income raised from Penalty Charge Notices issued funds the enforcement service. The Review Panel was informed that the level of deployment / number of CEOs is sufficient to cope with the existing level of resident parking zones.

However, if the number of zones increases then the number of CEOs will have to be increased accordingly. The level of deployment will be tailored to meet the level of non-compliance of the restrictions so that in effect it remains cost neutral and not an income generator.

### Role of Constituency Committees

The Review Panel initially considered that there could be a role for constituency committees around the engagement with residents (Such as letter dropping to gain resident support for a scheme or some observational work on those streets looking to apply for a scheme). Members highlighted a risk that there could be a perception schemes are easy to obtain and the Council will receive too many applications to process. A Council report on Resident Parking in 2007 was highlighted by officers that asked that the previous Area Forums to look at ensuring the requisite support and other criteria were met before a referral was made for consideration. However, there wasn't resource at that time to enable this and it is unlikely there would be resource now.

## 7. Conclusions and Recommendations

The Review Panel recognises the important role that resident parking schemes can play in providing residents with a reasonable chance of being able to park near to, but not necessarily directly outside, their homes. The Review Panel also recognises the high level of demand from residents of all parts of the borough for the introduction of such schemes and the impact that this demand has on available staff resources. There is also acknowledgement that some applications, whilst not meeting the current criteria in all regards, may have other special circumstances that should be taken into account and that there may be a need to provide for some officer discretion in the process of investigating such requests and to ensure that staff resources remain available to carry out those investigations.

Officers have suggested appropriate amendments to the existing policy criteria to take into account the resources required to demonstrate compliance whilst retaining the requirement for compliance with others for the reasons stated earlier in the report. Officers have also developed a policy statement to allow discretionary consideration to those applications made that may not meet all parts of the criteria and these are attached as **Appendix 4** to this report. Members of the Review Panel support an updated policy that reflects these changes and the inclusion of the policy statement. If the Resident Parking Policy is to be reviewed, it would be prudent of officers to identify and consider any issues relating to visitor passes to determine the best approach for managing these in terms of format and numbers.

### **Recommendation 1**

It is recommended that:

- i) The Resident Parking Policy is updated to reflect the proposed amendments to the existing criteria and the inclusion of a policy statement allowing discretionary consideration of applications where all parts of the criteria are not complied with as detailed in **Appendix 4** to this report;
- ii) A full review of the amended policy is carried out after the first two years of operation with a report back to the relevant Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the findings of that review and any other recommendations arising.

### **Recommendation 2**

It is recommended that applications for resident parking schemes should be accompanied by a non-refundable application fee to cover the cost of the initial investigation only. It is recommended that this fee is discounted from the introduction fee applied to successful applications

### **Recommendation 3**

Officers should review all issues relating to visitor passes to properties included within a resident parking scheme, including how these are issued and the number of passes per property, giving due regard to issues of effectiveness, cost and resources to administer.

The Review Panel notes that the level of permit fee has not changed since its introduction in 2007 despite increasing costs and supports officer views that this situation is neither sustainable nor equitable. The Review Panel also recognises that the administration of the current system of permit provision has evolved over many years and includes an obsolete legacy system that is no longer fit for purpose. Additionally, the level of maintenance of traffic signs and road markings required for a resident parking scheme draws resources away from maintenance of other traffic signs and road markings which have been provided for safety or other reasons.

In order to provide a permit system that is current and meets all necessary requirements and to ensure a suitable level of maintenance of the associated signs and lines, the Review Panel considers that residents who directly benefit from resident parking schemes should meet the associated cost. This includes the administration, maintenance and periodic reviews to be carried out, such as the scheme around Tranmere Rovers. This is the case for residents of new schemes introduced since 2007 which are subject to an annual permit fee, but residents of historic schemes introduced prior to 2007 which currently do not contribute towards the administration and maintenance of those schemes.

#### **Recommendation 4**

It is recommended that officers are provided with delegated powers to review and update the level of permit fee for resident parking schemes on an annual basis as part of the annual fees and charges review process; taking into account the cost of administration, maintenance and periodic reviews of the schemes to ensure they remain fit for purpose.

#### **Recommendation 5**

It is recommended that officers are instructed to commence the necessary legal processes to amend all historic resident parking schemes in order to implement permit fees.

## APPENDIX 1

### Scope Document

**Review Title: Resident Parking**

**Date: October 2016**

1. Contact Information:	
<b>Scrutiny Panel Chair:</b> Cllr. Jean Stapleton <a href="mailto:jeanstapleton@wirral.gov.uk">jeanstapleton@wirral.gov.uk</a>	<b>Scrutiny Officer(s):</b> Michael Lester <a href="mailto:michaellester@wirral.gov.uk">michaellester@wirral.gov.uk</a>
<b>Panel members:</b>  Cllr. Chris Blakely <a href="mailto:chrisblakeley@wirral.gov.uk">chrisblakeley@wirral.gov.uk</a>  Cllr. Dave Mitchell <a href="mailto:davemitchell@wirral.gov.uk">davemitchell@wirral.gov.uk</a>	<b>Departmental Link Officers:</b>  Keith Rodgers, Traffic Network Manager <a href="mailto:keithrodgers@wirral.gov.uk">keithrodgers@wirral.gov.uk</a>
<b>Other Key Contacts:</b>  Not applicable	
2. Review Aims:	
Which Wirral Plan Pledge does this review relate to?  'Transport and Technology Infrastructure fit for the future'	
What are the main issues?  The existing policy (established and approved in 2007) has resulted in the identification of issues relating to demonstrating compliance with the stated thresholds. This also includes the associated costs and resources required for this process.  Some residents have become increasingly frustrated with the difficulty in achieving their goal of implementing a new resident parking scheme in their road or neighbourhood. Since 2007, no requests for new resident parking schemes have been implemented since the introduction of the current policy.  There are a significant number of historic schemes in place that were introduced prior to 2007 which are administered and maintained free of charge. With budgetary pressures facing the Council, the administration and maintenance of these schemes will need to be considered moving forward.	
The Panel's objectives in doing this work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To understand the issues around the current resident parking scheme policy on new and existing resident parking schemes.</li><li>• To help inform the development of a new Resident Parking Scheme Policy for Wirral.</li></ul>	

<p>The desired outputs/outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Resident Parking Policy is developed that reflects the needs of both the Council and the residents of Wirral Council.</li> </ul>
<p>What specific value can scrutiny add to this topic?</p> <p>The scrutiny review will give Members an opportunity to understand and explore the issues relating to the existing Resident Parking Policy and to provide input into a new policy that meets the needs of both residents and the Council.</p>
<p><b>3. Review Approach</b></p>
<p>How will the Panel engage with the Executive?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approved scoping document will be shared with the Portfolio Holder</li> <li>• The draft report will be shared with the Portfolio Holder</li> <li>• The final report will be referred to Cabinet for consideration of the recommendations made following approval by committee.</li> </ul>
<p>Who will the Panel be trying to influence as part of its work?</p> <p>The Council leadership and senior management team</p>
<p>Duration of review?</p> <p>It is expected that the review will be completed and reported back to committee within a period of 6 months.</p>
<p>Extra resources needed? Would the investigation benefit from the co-operation of an expert witness?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No extra resources identified at this stage</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Sources of Evidence:</b></p>
<p>Secondary information (background information, existing reports, legislation, central government documents, etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee report on Resident Parking (reported to Business Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee in July 2016)</li> <li>• Existing Resident Parking Policy/Scheme</li> <li>• Details on resident parking schemes operated by other similar local authorities (including criteria, costs, take-up and consideration to visitor permits)</li> <li>• Relevant legislation impacting resident parking schemes and compliance to these.</li> <li>• Relevant news articles on resident parking issues and schemes.</li> </ul>
<p>Primary/new evidence/information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with relevant Council officers and residents</li> </ul>

Who can provide us with further relevant evidence? (Cabinet portfolio holder, officer, service user, general public, expert witness, etc).

- Resident stakeholders
- Steve Atkins (Parking Services Manager)
- Shaun Brady (Senior Group leader – Highway Maintenance)
- Constituency Committee Manager

What specific areas do we want them to cover when they give evidence?

- The issues affecting residents in relation to residential parking and implementation of local resident parking schemes.
- An understanding of the administration and enforcement of resident parking schemes, including staff resourcing and costs.
- Legislation and maintenance requirement for resident parking scheme signs and lines.
- Suggestions for developing a new resident parking permit scheme.
- The Potential role of Constituency Committees to support any new resident parking scheme.

What processes can we use to feed into the review? (site visits/observations, face-to-face questioning, telephone survey, written questionnaire, etc).

- Face-to-face questioning
- Desk top research
- Questionnaires

In what ways can we involve the public and at what stages? (consider whole range of consultative mechanisms, local committees and local ward mechanisms).

A number of residents are to be invited to an evidence session to discuss issues relating to the existing Resident Parking Policy.

Should we involve the Press & Public Relations Team at any stage of the review? (Homepage news release, press releases etc)

Press & Public Relations Team to be notified at scoping stage of the review.

## APPENDIX 2

### CRITERIA FOR THE INTRODUCTION AND OPERATION OF RESIDENT PARKING SCHEMES (Approved by Cabinet 28th March 2007)

#### Criteria

In deciding whether or not a scheme should be introduced, the desirability of the scheme should be measured against certain criteria guidelines to determine the need, the acceptability and its practicality.

- a. Not less than 85% of the available kerbside space is occupied for more than six hours between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on five or more days a week from Monday to Saturday, and a bona fide need of residents is established. At least 50% of the 85% occupied kerbside space must be non-residents. This is to ensure that before a scheme is considered, it is shown that the existing spaces are heavily used by non-residents and difficulty is experienced in finding a space on most days of the week.
- b. Not more than 50% of the car-owning residents have or could have parking available within the curtilage of their property or within 200 metres walking distance by way of rented garages or other off-street space. This is to ensure that schemes are only introduced where a real need can be identified.
- c. The normal daily demand for resident spaces can be met. On roads with a carriageway width of less than 6.6m it is important to protect the remaining carriageway with parking restrictions so as to be able to maintain a relatively free flow of traffic and to protect the pavement (which is part of the highway) from being parked upon. This measure would be in the form of parking restrictions denoted by yellow lines and is recommended along one side of the road for roads supporting a resident parking scheme and having a carriageway width of less than 6.6m. This essential measure has implications on the ability of a road to meet the normal daily demand for resident spaces.
- d. The introduction of the scheme will not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.
- e. The scheme is acceptable both to the Police and the operations of the emergency services.
- f. The proposals are acceptable to the majority of the residents.  
There must be a minimum of 80% support for the scheme from all residential properties with the scheme boundary (including nil returns). This is to ensure majority support from residents for the introduction of a scheme.
- g. In areas where parking space is severely limited, the introduction of reserved parking does not seriously affect the commercial viability of the area.
- h. There must normally be a minimum of 300 residential properties within the proposed scheme. For schemes of less than 300 residential properties, there must be other waiting restrictions in the immediate vicinity. This is to ensure that the enforcement of the scheme would be self-financing.

***This page is left intentionally blank***



### APPENDIX 3 – Other Local Authority Schemes (Background Research)

Council	Scheme Criteria Eligibility
Derbyshire	<p>Streets in question must experience high levels of non-resident parking (for example by shoppers and commuters) for long periods of the day, meaning that residents find it difficult to park their vehicles. Typical locations would be in areas close to railway stations or busy town centres. Successful residents' parking schemes are those that cover a defined 'zone' - incorporating several streets - as implementing a scheme in isolation would invariably displace the parking problem to neighbouring streets.</p> <p>A scheme must be self-financing and a charge is applicable for each parking permit, the revenue from which will be used to pay for the cost of running the scheme (for administering permits, enforcement costs). At current charging rates, several hundred households would need to sign up to a proposed scheme for it to be financially viable. An extensive consultation would be carried out for any proposed scheme and an overwhelming majority of residents would need to be in support of the scheme and willing to pay for a permit.</p>
Sefton	<p>Sefton has a moratorium on any new resident parking schemes. Exceptions are made if a development has changed parking patterns and the developer funds the scheme or where Councillors are willing to use their ward funds.</p>
Hyndburn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of the property owners must be willing to participate in the scheme. At present, there is no current Council funding stream therefore, the participating residents must be willing to meet the set up costs of the scheme and agree to pay the annual fee for permits.</li> <li>• The possible effect on nearby streets. A scheme that merely transferred the problem onto another street could not be supported. This generally means that schemes have to be dealt with in terms of the parking situation on adjacent streets.</li> <li>• The severity of the parking problem. The requirement set by the Council is that at least 60% of the available spaces are occupied by non-residents (and at least 80% in total) for more than 6 hours between 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. or for more than 4 hours between 6.00 p.m. and midnight.</li> <li>• If the initial criteria are met, then specific issues such as residents' individual needs, visitor parking demand, adequacy of parking space to meet residents' needs, availability of alternative parking and level of enforcement would need to be considered.</li> </ul>

Council	Scheme Criteria Eligibility
Preston	<p>A two-tier arrangement exists in the Preston area for residents parking schemes. The City Council currently administer the issue of permits but the highway authority, Lancashire County Council, is responsible for the maintenance of existing zones and the implementation of new zones.</p> <p><u>Criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not less than 67% of the available kerb space should be occupied for more than six hours between 8.00am and 6.00pm on five or more days in a week from Monday to Saturday and a bona fide need of the residents should be established. Note: 'Available kerb space' is defined as the length of unrestricted carriageway where parking could be permitted. This would of course exclude junctions, accesses and areas subject to existing waiting restrictions (but not limited waiting).</li> <li>• Not more than 50% of the car owning residents have or could make parking available within the curtilage of their property, or within 200 metres (walking distance) of that property in the form of rented space or garages etc. Off-street parking space should not be available within 200 metres walking distance. Note: Off-street car parks are considered as an available facility for local residents but not where an hourly/daily charge is made (e.g. pay and display) unless contract arrangements or similar have been provided.</li> <li>• The peak or normal working day demand for residents' spaces should be able to be met. Note: The parking problem or peak demand time may be outside the normal working day, e.g. next to a shift working factory or hospital, and this should be taken into consideration.</li> <li>• When considering the introduction of concessions for residents within an existing restricted area the re-introduction of a limited number of parked vehicles should not negate the original reasons for introducing the restrictions.</li> <li>• The Police should be satisfied that a reasonable level of enforcement of the proposals can be maintained or alternatively that enforcement could be adequately carried out by some alternative means.</li> <li>• The proposals should be acceptable to the greater proportion of the residents. A 75% response rate from households, with greater than 50% of these being in favour of the scheme, is considered acceptable.</li> <li>• The introduction of the scheme should not be likely to cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.</li> </ul>

Council	Scheme Criteria Eligibility
Cheshire West & Chester	<p><b>There must be a genuine need for the Residents' Parking Scheme.</b></p> <p>A Scheme will only be considered where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is only limited or no off-street parking</li> <li>• Residents are unable to park near to where they live because 40% or more of the available space is regularly taken by other road users and;</li> <li>• There is not enough space to accommodate either residents' needs or residents' and non-residents' day time parking needs; and</li> <li>• The majority of residents have a need for on street parking (51% or more in the proposed area).</li> </ul> <p>Where a request for a scheme does not fulfil the criteria above its introduction will not be considered unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction of a scheme will be the most effective and appropriate way to address existing road safety problems or access needs;</li> <li>• The scheme is necessary to address the adverse impact from new developments in a residential area;</li> <li>• The scheme is to be introduced as part of a wider integrated traffic or parking management scheme or to encourage use of alternative facilities such as off street parking or park and ride schemes.</li> </ul> <p><b>The majority of the community should support the Scheme</b></p> <p>A scheme will not be imposed upon a community. Its purpose is to improve the quality of life for those residents who require on-street parking and its success will rely on the support and cooperation of the residents living in the proposed Parking Scheme area. For this reason a scheme will only be considered (and implemented) where there is clear support from residents affected by the scheme. Therefore, a scheme will only be considered where an initial request for the introduction of a Scheme is supported by at least 10 residents (or representatives from 25% of households) from the road or area experiencing problems.</p> <p>Where it is determined that there is a genuine need for a scheme, it will be implemented only where the majority (at least 51%) of households in the proposed area agree to its introduction. The level of support for a Scheme will be determined through consultation with residents.</p> <p><b>Prioritisation of requests for Schemes</b></p> <p>Requests for schemes will be considered annually during a defined period.</p> <p>Potentially viable schemes will undergo a feasibility test. If the proposed scheme fails the assessment it will not be progressed any further.</p>

Council	Scheme Criteria Eligibility
St Helens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not less than 85% of the available kerb space should be occupied for more than 6 hours between 8am and 6pm on five or more days per week from Monday to Friday and a bona fide need of the residents must be established.</li> <li>• Not more than 50% of the car owning residents have or could make parking available within the curtilage of their property, or within 200 metres walking distance of that property in the form of rented space or garages etc. Off street parking should not be available within 200 metres walking distance.</li> <li>• The peak or normal working day demand for resident's spaces should be able to be met.</li> <li>• The Council should be satisfied that a reasonable level of enforcement of the proposals can be maintained.</li> <li>• The introduction of the scheme should not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.</li> <li>• Such schemes are typically introduced either in or in close proximity to commercial areas where parking activity during daytime hours has been affecting the ability of residents to park near to their properties where alternatives exist for visiting motorists, i.e., town centre car parks.</li> </ul>
Flintshire	<p><u>Initial Principals for consideration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be clear evidence of residents support for a scheme in advance of any details of the scheme being prepared.</li> <li>• The enforcement associated with all schemes to be undertaken by the Councils Civil Parking Enforcement Officers.</li> <li>• Residents' parking schemes would not be introduced where the majority of residents have off-street parking or where there is insufficient on-street space to accommodate both residential and non-residential parking.</li> <li>• Generally schemes should not be introduced to manage parking in situations where the problem is linked to over demand from residents for on-street spaces.</li> <li>• There is a presumption against small isolated areas remote from the principle areas of parking enforcement.</li> </ul> <p><u>The following general principles are then applied</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 50% of properties in any proposed area to have no off-street parking.</li> <li>• At times when parking problems are caused by non-residents the kerb space occupied by residents should exceed 40% of the total available.</li> <li>• There is sufficient kerb space to enable 85% of all households to park at least one vehicle on-street.</li> <li>• Schemes should not create unacceptable problems on adjacent roads.</li> <li>• The introduction of reserved parking in areas where parking spaces are severely limited shall not affect the commercial viability of the area.</li> </ul>

Council	Scheme Criteria Eligibility
	<p>Any requests that do not meet these criteria will not be considered further unless:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme forms part of a wider integrated traffic/parking management scheme.</li> <li>• There are road safety problems.</li> <li>• The parking impact from development in residential areas would be adverse.</li> <li>• There are schemes being promoted to use alternative facilities such as off-street parking.</li> </ul> <p>The number of Residents' Permits available to one property will be specific to the scheme, to allow some flexibility in interpretation</p> <p><u>Guidelines to be adopted to underpin permit provision:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initially one permit and one visitor permit will be issued to an individual residence but subject to an assessment of parking demand/supply within a zone, additional permits may be available.</li> <li>• Where a residence has at least one off-street parking space available, it would not be eligible for the full allocation of residential permits per residence. It would however be eligible for any allocation of visitors' permits and may be eligible for any subsequent allocation of second round residents' permits.</li> <li>• Residents' permits will normally be specific to one registered vehicle and proof of ownership/responsibility must be provided to the satisfaction of the Council.</li> <li>• Residents who are only entitled or choose to apply for only one permit may specify two registration numbers to be inserted on the permit, to enable them to decide which vehicle is parked in the bays and to avoid swapping cars on and off a driveway.</li> </ul>
Tameside	<p>Applications for a Residents' Parking Scheme will only be considered if it is genuinely considered that the majority of residents in the area / vicinity want such a scheme. The Council will then undertake a survey subject to the process identified below to ascertain the local views).</p> <p>Majority is defined as:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 50% of residents (1 per dwelling within a zone) must support the introduction of a Residents Parking Scheme.</li> <li>• If less than 50% of residents respond to the questionnaire it is then assumed that the residents are unwilling to support the introduction of a RPZ or Residents Parking Scheme.</li> </ul>

Council	Scheme Criteria Eligibility
	<p>The size of an area or zone considered appropriate for the implementation of a Residents' Parking Scheme is important. Single roads would not normally be considered. It is envisaged that a whole estate or other area with natural boundaries would be more appropriate for a scheme to be effective, as any displaced parking would likely also affect surrounding areas. A 'zoned' parking scheme is therefore preferred for most applications.</p>
Southampton	<p>In areas where there is limited on-street parking capacity due to excess demand by non-residents (e.g. commuters), Southampton City Council will consider implementing a Resident Parking scheme if all of the following circumstances apply;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is sufficient on-street capacity for a scheme to be practical</li> <li>• It can be demonstrated that the non-residents parking in the area are doing so for extended periods</li> <li>• Formalisation of the on-street parking does not lead to access or safety issues (as outlined in Policy Statement RP3)</li> <li>• Where parking issues may be displaced to neighbouring streets, these residents will also be consulted over any prospective permit scheme and boundary.</li> <li>• Initial support for the proposal from a representative group of residents has been demonstrated before investigations are carried out</li> </ul> <p>Consideration will also be given to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proximity of local shops and businesses and the impact of the proposal on customer parking</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 4 – Proposed Policy Changes

CURRENT CRITERIA	PROPOSED CRITERIA (Changes in bold and italics)
<p>a) Not less than 85% of the available kerbside space is occupied for more than six hours between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on five or more days a week from Monday to Saturday, and a bona fide need of residents is established. At least 50% of the 85% occupied kerbside space must be non-residents.</p> <p>This is to ensure that before a scheme is considered, it is shown that the existing spaces are heavily used by non-residents and difficulty is experienced in finding a space on most days of the week.</p>	<p><b><i>a) Observations taken during the reported primary periods of non-residential parking indicate that residents are unable to park near to where they live due to 50% or more of the available spaces being regularly taken by other road users.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>This is to ensure that before a scheme is considered, it is Shown that the existing spaces are heavily used by non-residents.</i></b></p>
<p>b). Not more than 50% of the car-owning residents have or could have parking available within the curtilage of their property or within 200 metres walking distance by way of rented garages or other off-street space.</p> <p>This is to ensure that schemes are only introduced where a real need can be identified.</p>	<p><b><i>b). Not more than 50% of the car-owning residents have or could have parking available within the curtilage of their property.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>This is to ensure that schemes are only introduced where a real need can be identified.</i></b></p>
<p>c). The normal daily demand for resident spaces can be met.</p> <p>On roads with a carriageway width of less than 6.6m it is important to protect the remaining carriageway with parking restrictions so as to be able to maintain a relatively free flow of traffic and to protect the pavement (which is part of the highway) from being parked upon. This measure would be in the form of parking restrictions denoted by yellow lines and is recommended along one side of the road for roads supporting a resident parking scheme and having a carriageway width of less than 6.6m. This essential measure has implications on the ability of a road to meet the normal daily demand for resident spaces.</p>	<p>c). The normal daily demand for resident spaces can be met.</p> <p>On roads with a carriageway width of less than 6.6m it is important to protect the remaining carriageway with parking restrictions so as to be able to maintain a relatively free flow of traffic and to protect the pavement (which is part of the highway) from being parked upon. This measure would be in the form of parking restrictions denoted by yellow lines and is recommended along one side of the road for roads supporting a resident parking scheme and having a carriageway width of less than 6.6m. This essential measure has implications on the ability of a road to meet the normal daily demand for resident spaces.</p>

d). The introduction of the scheme will not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.	d). The introduction of the scheme will not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.
e). The scheme is acceptable both to the Police and the operations of the emergency services.	e). The scheme is acceptable both to the Police and the operations of the emergency services.
f). The proposals are acceptable to the majority of the residents.  There must be a minimum of 80% support for the scheme from all residential properties within the scheme boundary (including nil returns). This is to ensure majority support from residents for the introduction of a scheme.	f). The proposals are acceptable to the majority of the residents.  There must be a minimum of 80% support for the scheme from all residential properties within the scheme boundary (including nil returns). This is to ensure majority support from residents for the introduction of a scheme.
g). In areas where parking space is severely limited, the introduction of reserved parking does not seriously affect the commercial viability of the area.	g). In areas where parking space is severely limited, the introduction of reserved parking does not seriously affect the commercial viability of the area.
h). There must normally be a minimum of 300 residential properties within the proposed scheme. For schemes of less than 300 residential properties, there must be other waiting restrictions in the immediate vicinity.  This is to ensure that the enforcement of the scheme would be self-financing.	h). There must normally be a minimum of 300 residential properties within the proposed scheme. For schemes of less than 300 residential properties, there must be other waiting restrictions in the immediate vicinity.  This is to ensure that the enforcement of the scheme would be self-financing.

**Where a request for a scheme does not fulfil the criteria above its introduction will not be considered unless:**

- 1. The introduction of a scheme will be the most effective and appropriate way to address existing road safety problems or access needs;**
- 2. The scheme is necessary to address the adverse impact from new development in a residential area;**
- 3. The scheme is to be introduced as part of a wider integrated traffic or parking management scheme or to encourage use of alternative facilities such as off-street parking or park and ride schemes.**