



WIRRAL COUNCIL

BUSINESS OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

12 JULY 2016

REPORT TITLE	RESIDENT PARKING POLICY
REPORT OF	HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT AND REGULATION

REPORT SUMMARY

This report reviews the current policy for new resident parking schemes and operation of existing schemes and highlights those areas which have been identified as issues by residents, ward members and/or officers.

The report highlights that there are areas where the current policy should be investigated in more detail and consideration given to appropriate amendments.

This matter affects all Wards within the borough and is a key decision.

RECOMMENDATION/S

Committee is requested to:

- i) Note the content of this report.
- ii) Consider the issues around the current policy on new and existing resident parking schemes, possibly via a Task & Finish Group.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1.0 REASON/S FOR RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1.1 The current policy around new and existing resident parking schemes has been in place for several years and various issues in relation to it have been identified in that time.
- 1.2 The various issues and potential options are technically detailed and may benefit from a focussed “task and finish” working group to identify those options which could be taken forward as improvements to the existing policy.

2.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1 Taking no action. This is not considered a suitable option given the issues that have been identified around the existing policy.
- 2.2 Developing a Cabinet Report for detailing the various issues and options and requesting consideration and a decision by members on suitable amendments to the policy. This is not considered a suitable option given the scale and detail surrounding the various issues and options for improvement, which would benefit from more in-depth scrutiny and development with relevant member involvement and officer support before reporting options to Cabinet for a decision.

3.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 Resident parking schemes on Wirral has been the subject of a number of historic reports over several years, the most recent being to Cabinet on 16 August 2007. The current criteria for new resident parking schemes developed gradually over a number of iterations to the version in operation today which is attached as **Appendix 1** to this report.
- 3.2 The criteria pose various issues in respect of the practicalities of demonstrating compliance with the various thresholds, the resources and costs involved in that process and the difficulties for residents wishing to apply (including demonstrating initial support and also financing implementation). These issues are also noted in **Appendix 1** to this report, in boxes below each criterion.
- 3.3 By way of confirmation of the difficulties residents face in demonstrating that they can achieve compliance with the criteria, no requests for new resident parking schemes have been implemented since the introduction of the current policy despite numerous enquiries. The three schemes that have been implemented since the introduction of the current policy were initially proposed, supported and funded from sources other than the residents themselves and none of them meet the minimum 300 property criterion. **Appendix 2** lists those three schemes with background information for each.

- 3.4 Consequently, some members and residents have become increasingly frustrated with the difficulty in achieving their goal of implementing a new resident parking scheme in their road or neighbourhood.
- 3.5 As well as those issues around the criteria, there are other areas that would benefit from review such as visitor permits, which are currently restricted to one per property. This can create difficulties for residents with more than one visitor who are then reliant on the goodwill of neighbours by borrowing additional permits from them.
- 3.6 In addition, the existing historic resident parking schemes introduced before 2007 are administered and maintained free of charge to those benefitting from them. This may be viewed as unfair in relation to those residents of new schemes implemented since 2007, for whom a permit fee is payable. Also, with the reductions in Council income over recent and coming years, the administration and maintenance of the historic schemes will become more difficult and a greater strain on departmental resources that could otherwise be directed at highway and transport issues around road safety, congestion and economic development.
- 3.7 Beneficial updates to government regulations on signing and road markings for resident parking schemes are also difficult or impossible to take advantage of within existing historic schemes due to the resource issues mentioned in 3.5, as is periodic review and amendment of those schemes to ensure that they continue to be relevant and not adversely affect adjacent residential roads outside of the schemes.

4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation of this report.

5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no legal implications arising from the recommendation of this report.

6.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: ICT, STAFFING AND ASSETS

- 6.1 Existing staff resources would be used to provide officer support to any working group set up as a consequence of this report.

7.0 RELEVANT RISKS

- 7.1 Failure to review the policy and criteria will mean that the frustration of some members and residents at the shortcomings of the existing arrangements will continue and that the administration and maintenance of historic schemes will continue to draw on departmental resources that could otherwise be directed at highway and transport issues around road safety, congestion and economic development.

8.0 ENGAGEMENT/CONSULTATION

8.1 The extent of engagement / consultation to be carried out as part of any review of policy would be for the working group to consider.

9.0 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Has the potential impact of your proposal(s) been reviewed with regard to equality?

9.2 No because there is no relevance to equality. Blue (Disabled) Badge Holders are exempted from the requirement to display a resident permit.

REPORT AUTHOR: Keith Rodgers
Traffic Network Manager
telephone: (0151) 606 2101
email: keithrodgers@wirral.gov.uk

APPENDICES

1. Resident Parking Criteria
2. New Resident Parking Schemes introduced since 2007

REFERENCE MATERIAL

None

SUBJECT HISTORY (last 3 years)

Council Meeting	Date
None	

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

An outline of issues is included in boxes below each criterion.

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.

Evidence gathering for this criterion is resource intensive in terms of the resources required 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.

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.

Evidence gathering for this criterion is difficult or impossible as it is not easy to ascertain how many residents are actually car owners and whether any of those that are car owners (but do not have visible driveways) have off-street parking available elsewhere within 200 metres.

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.

This criterion is difficult to evidence because assumptions have to be made about "normal daily demand for resident spaces". In some circumstances, it may be obvious that space is available (for example, in long roads with few houses), but in many cases residential car ownership & parking demand versus available kerbside parking space is not easy to quantify without making arbitrary assumptions.

d. The introduction of the scheme will not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.

This criterion is subjective as a view would need to be taken on the level and location of displaced parking should a scheme go ahead and then consideration given as to the potential impact of that displaced parking in those locations.

e. The scheme is acceptable both to the Police and the operations of the emergency services.

This criterion is clear and can be evidenced.

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.

This criterion is clear and can be evidenced. The threshold of 80% support can prove difficult for residents to achieve.

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

This criterion is subjective and reliant on taking a view about the proximity of a proposed scheme to local businesses, the type of businesses involved and the likely impact on that type of business of removing the ability for non-residential (potential customer?) parking. The solution is relatively straight-forward if commercial viability is thought to be affected and involves allowing non-permit holders to park for a suitable limited period, although this does water down the effectiveness of the permit scheme in removing non-residential parking.

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 criterion has loose wording, but the thresholds can be evidenced. The “threshold” of 300 properties can prove difficult for residents to achieve.

NEW RESIDENT PARKING SCHEMES IMPLEMENTED SINCE SELF-FUNDING CRITERIA WAS AGREED IN MARCH 2007

Since the introduction of new criteria in 2007, three schemes have been implemented;

Manor Lane, Liscard

Introduced; September 2011

Involves nine properties opposite a primary school. Introduced in conjunction with other traffic management as a road safety measure to reduce vehicle movements in the vicinity of the school. Subject of a report to Highways and Traffic Representation Panel on 8 July 2010. Financed by residents & school.

Heath Drive, Heswall

Introduced; April 2014

Involves 14 properties in a cul-de-sac adjacent to Heswall Medical Centre. Introduced as a road safety measure in relation to a planning condition attached to a development proposal to expand the Medical Centre (APP/12/01436 – delegated approval 5 February 2013). Financed by the Medical Centre developer.

Virginia Road area, New Brighton

Introduced; July 2015

Involves approx. 280 properties between Virginia Road and Victoria Road. Introduced as part of highway improvements in New Brighton (including resurfacing of Marine Promenade), following public consultation on the proposed improvements. Financed through the capital programme for the highway improvements.

As at April 2016, there are a total of 345 permits on issue for the above three schemes, at a rate of £10 per year = £3,450 per year.