



Report to Planning and Transportation PDR Panel

Date: **28 September 2009**

Report of: **Chief Planning and Transportation Officer**

Subject: **FAREHAM TOWN CENTRE RESIDENTIAL PARKING REVIEW -
POSITION UPDATE**

SUMMARY

This update report summarises the main findings of the first consultation, identifies options for the residential parking scheme and proposes a way forward for the second consultation.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Transportation Policy and Development Review Panel agrees that:-

- a) The Traffic Regulation Order, Residents Permit and area extension proposals set out in this report for consultation purposes.
- b) The outcome of the second consultation be reported to the Planning and Transportation Policy and Development Review Panel in early 2010.

INTRODUCTION

1. Members will be aware that a consultation process is underway for the Residential Parking Review arising from the Fareham Town Centre Parking Strategy. A report was presented to the Planning and Transportation Review Panel in January 2009 and the proposals were approved by the Executive at its meeting on 9 February 2009.
2. The first consultation has been completed and the results analysed. The second consultation is planned to commence in October 2009 to enable the final decision on the scheme to be made by the Executive by March 2010, after consideration again by this Panel, so that the implementation date of Summer 2010 can be met. It is proposed that the second consultation will consider the proposed resident parking scheme and permits in more detail. This report provides an update on the first stage of consultation and the changes proposed as a result of the comments received. The report also considers the details of the proposed permit scheme for consultation with residents.

CONSULTATION

First Consultation Findings

3. The outcome of this first consultation is shown in section 3 of Appendix A attached. In general there was a good response and residents were supportive of the proposals. A total of 637 responses were received out of the 2500 letters delivered. In most areas over 80% of the respondents supported the proposals, although in two areas less than half supported the proposals. There were a small number of areas where revised proposals were suggested by residents or they requested no change. A summary of the comments received is included at Appendix B.
4. There were a number of general enquiries common to most areas and these were mainly about the operation of any permit scheme. It was intended that these issues would be covered in more detail in the second consultation and are considered later in this report. The further information sought were requests for:
 - More detail of permit pricing;
 - More detail on dealing with visitor permits;
 - The need for permits to park across a dropped crossing;
 - Where permits would be valid, the specification about allocation of permits and zonal groupings of streets;
 - What would arrangements be for Blue Badge Holders (BBH) and disabled bays in permit areas.
5. The responses received have been reviewed in some detail, and where possible the views expressed have been taken into account in developing a revised set of proposals. A summary of the proposed revisions to the initial proposals is set out in paragraph 6. In addition, the plans included at Appendix C show the revised proposals which will be circulated to residents as part of the second consultation.

6. Summarised below are the main changes to the proposals for roads within each area put forward in the first consultation:

Area A: Unchanged, except withdraw proposed restrictions on north side of Serpentine Road;

Area B: Withdraw proposals for Westborn Road and Palmerston Avenue;

Area C: Deanes Park Road: extend yellow lines in front of water works. Bath Lane Lower: switch residents parking to east side of the road. Cams Hill: withdraw restrictions outside cottages and on south side of the road, but retain short stay parking outside the Delme Arms;

Area D: High Street: withdraw the proposals for Sunday restrictions. Meanwhile retain the proposed 30 minute maximum stay and residents exemption on the north section of the east side of the High Street;

Area E: Unchanged, except add residents parking to west side of New Road;

Area F: Unchanged;

Area G: Kings Road: add residents' parking on the west side, south of Queens Road. Western Road: introduce residents parking on the south side, west of Kings Road. Add disabled parking bays to Kings Road outside church and on Western Road outside the British Legion;

Area H: Unchanged;

Area K: (formerly Area I). Delme Drive: extend restrictions on south side.

7. In addition to these changes there were a number of requests to extend the residents parking scheme to the following areas which are considered later in this report:-

Area A: Extend area to Uplands Crescent and Serpentine Road;

Area K (formerly Area I): East Hill Close: add the same restrictions as Radclyffe Road (No waiting for 2 hour period). Waterside Gardens: extend short section of double yellow lines.

Proposed Second Consultation

8. The purpose of the second consultation is principally to consider with residents the details of the proposed residents parking scheme. This includes the issues of cost and validity of permits for residents, visitors and professional or trade visits. Residents will be asked for their views on the proposals before they are finalised and brought back to this Panel for consideration in January 2010 and to the Executive for final decision by March 2010, on the measures arising from the Residential Parking Review to be implemented.

9. The consultation will commence in October 2009 when residents will receive a letter advising them of the outcome of the first consultation and a plan showing the revised Traffic Regulation Order proposals. Those residents who are in the street where it is proposed to introduce a residents parking scheme will also receive an information sheet on the operation of the permits and a survey form for completion and return. For the extension areas, a special questionnaire will be sent to those properties seeking residents views on the proposals. There will also be a drop in session on 3 November 2009 for residents who have questions about the proposals and there will be at least 6 weeks for residents to respond to the consultation.

PERMITS

10. The streets where a residents parking scheme will operate are shown on the plans in Appendix C. The proposed details of permits are set out in sections 5-8 of Appendix A and an information sheet included as Appendix D to this report. The key points about the residents parking scheme and issue of permits are set out in the following paragraphs. These relate to residents who live in a street where a residents parking scheme is introduced.
11. Hours of operation (Appendix C) - The residents parking scheme will generally operate Monday to Saturday between 8am and 6pm, although there may be some exceptions due to particular circumstances and these will be shown on the TRO proposals plans. During the operational hours a permit or Blue Badge must be displayed at all times. Outside those hours no permit will be necessary.
12. Cost of permits (Appendix A, Section 5) – It is proposed that the sale of permits will cover the Council's costs. If Members wish to recover implementation and operational costs then each permit would not be more than £50 each. If implementation costs do not need to be recovered there could be a corresponding reduction in permit costs.
13. Permit allocation (Appendix A, Section 6) – On-street parking spaces are limited, it is therefore proposed that in most cases households will only be permitted to purchase two permits. In streets identified with a particular problem, only one permit may be purchased initially, with a review after 3-6 months to see if there is scope for increasing the issue. Permits will only be issued for vehicles registered at properties in the streets with a scheme and will be valid for all streets in the relevant zone. Appropriate verification will be required for company cars, short term hire cars etc. If a resident does not live in a street with a residents parking scheme then they will not be able to purchase permits. There are a number of properties with no off-street parking who currently park on streets which will become permit only zones. It is not proposed at this stage to offer permits to these residents, but it could be reviewed if there are sufficient on-street spaces available.
14. Visitors (Appendix A Section 7) – visitors will be accommodated through the issues of 'visitor day permits'. Initially it is proposed that 10 visitor day permits will be given free with each resident's permit, and that further ones could be purchased at 10 for £10, up to a maximum of 30. Residents who do not

purchase a permit would be able to purchase visitor day permits. However, this will be subject to consultation and Member decision. Trade vehicles would be subject to the current dispensation policy or could use a visitor permit from the property they are working at. Health visitors would qualify for the special permit scheme.

15. Blue Badge Holders (Appendix A Section 8) - BBH's who are residents would be eligible for a free permit for their own vehicle. Other BBH's would be able to park for up to 3 hours without displaying a permit, provided the Blue Badge is displayed.
16. Regrettably, it is not practicable to permit residents to park across dropped kerbs without a permit. Members may be aware that the law has recently changed and it is now an offence to park across pedestrian or vehicle crossings with lowered kerbs (dropped kerbs) causing an obstruction. However residents who park across their own vehicle crossing whilst displaying a permit will not be penalised.

REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION OF THE REVIEW AREA

17. A number of streets adjacent to the proposed parking review areas have made representations requesting that their street also be included. This mainly arises from concerns that non residential vehicles will transfer from the controlled area to the next street. The main areas where this has been identified include:
 - To the north, south and east of Area A (Southampton Road Area) - Uplands Crescent, Serpentine Road, Wickham Road and Old Turnpike;
 - To east of Area K, Wallington Village – East Hill Close, Waterside Gardens.
18. Members will recall that the area for review was limited to match the funding available. It was intended that the area should not be extended because it may result in costs exceeding the budget. The additional roads are therefore considered on the basis that they would only be brought forward if funding became available and members agreed to their inclusion in the review area.
19. Wickham Road – there is unlimited waiting on Wickham Road outside the review area, but residents are concerned for the safety of their vehicles because of the narrowness of the A32 at this point, and park in Southampton Road. The developer of St Christopher's Hospital is committed to making a highway contribution for the introduction of TRO's on Wickham Road, including a change in speed limit. It is therefore proposed that Wickham Road is considered as part of that developer funded scheme.
20. Old Turnpike – this road has recently been subject to a TRO to prevent parking because of congestion and damage to verges. There is a short length of waiting permitted near the southern end of the road, and a daytime restriction along most of the remainder of the road with some complete prohibition of waiting. Some residents use Southampton Road in which to park. It is recommended that this be considered at the same time as Wickham Road, given that some properties front onto both roads.

21. Uplands Crescent, Serpentine Road (northern part) – a number of residents identified a problem with long stay parking in these roads. Preliminary surveys show that there is non-residential all day parking. This is likely to increase when the measures are introduced within the town centre area. It is therefore suggested that residents of these roads and the adjoining Mead Close be included in the second consultation. Final inclusion of any measures within these streets would be subject to implementation being achieved within the agreed budget for the review. A suggested proposals map is attached in Appendix E as Area 'Ae'.
22. East Hill Close – a number of residents in East Hill Close contacted the Council as a result of the consultation process asking if they could be included in the area and suggested waiting restrictions for part of the working day. East Hill Close is partly in the town review area and as the proposals requested are low cost, they have been added to the proposals map. This has been included in Appendix C.
23. Waterside Gardens – a problem was identified as vehicles enter the cul-de sac. The change would only involve a small length of additional marking. It is therefore proposed that this is included on the TRO proposals map.
24. Delme Drive – residents asked that the proposed waiting restrictions be extended a short length to clear a narrow point in the entrance to the cul-de sac. It is proposed that this amendment is included on the TRO proposals map.

PROGRAMME

25. A summary of the indicative programme and key dates is shown below. .

Activity	Period of time / Dates
2nd Consultation	12th Oct - 27th Nov 2009
Analysis of 2nd Consultation	20th Nov - 11th Dec
Committee Report Completed	11th Dec
Review Panel	12th Jan 2010
Executive	8th Feb
TRO Preparation and Publish Orders	10th Feb - 31st March
TRO Objections & Objections Report	1 st April - 30 th April
Tender Works	1st May - 30th May
Implementation	1st June - 30th July

FINANCIAL

26. The Executive allocated £100,000 to implement residents parking. The additional measures are low cost and it is anticipated on the basis of the current proposals and budget estimates that the small additional costs can be accommodated within existing budgets.

RISK ASSESSMENT

27. An assessment of risks and opportunities associated with this matter is attached at Appendix F.

CONCLUSIONS

28. As part of the implementation of the Fareham Town Centre Parking Strategy a consultation has been undertaken for the town centre residential parking review. The response from residents was generally supportive. However, a number of changes to the TRO proposals have been identified as a result of the consultation, and changes have been made to the TRO Plans to reflect residents' views where practicable.
29. In addition, requests were received for additional roads to be included within the review. Funding is limited and it is not possible to increase the residential parking review area widely. However, there are some low cost additions linked to the review area which officers believe could be completed within budget. The appropriate proposals have been included on the TRO proposals plans for consideration and consultation.
30. The next stage of consultation will consider the details of the proposed permit scheme with residents as set out in this report and Appendix D, and possible extensions to the town centre review area as set out in this report and Appendix E. The details are set out in paragraphs 8-24 and Members support for the consultation is sought.

APPENDICES:

- A: [HTP Consulting. Residents Parking Review: Update Report](#)
- B: [Questionnaire and Summary of Response by Area](#) - Stage 1 Consultation
- C: [TRO Proposals Plans](#)
- D: [Resident Permit Scheme information sheet](#)
- E: [TRO plan for proposed extension Area Ae](#)
- F: Risk Assessment

Background Paper:

HTP Consulting Report of First Consultation

Reference Papers:

None

Enquiries:

For further information on this report please contact Andy Viccars. (Ext 4591)

Chief Executive Officer
Civic Offices,
Civic Way,
Fareham
PO16 7AZ
www.fareham.gov.uk

RISK ASSESSMENT

Impact	Description	Potential Risks	Comments	Potential Opportunities	Comments
CORPORATE OBJECTIVES	<p>Implications in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieving Corporate Objectives and Priorities • Corporate Governance Responsibilities 	<p>A Safe and Healthy Place to Live and Work</p> <p>Maintaining and Extending Prosperity</p>	<p>Residents experience difficulty in parking near their property due to long stay on-street parking particularly those with young children or who work shifts.</p> <p>The introduction of the proposals could affect recruitment as potential employees find parking unattractive.</p>	<p>A Safe and Healthy Place to Live and Work</p> <p>Maintaining and Extending Prosperity</p>	<p>A well balanced scheme could assist residents whilst providing parking conditions that do not deter workers from seeking employment in Fareham town centre. It could also encourage more use of public transport or car sharing.</p>
PARTNERSHIPS	<p>Implications for any existing partnership arrangements</p> <p>Risks or opportunities for new partnerships</p>	<p>Until the scheme is finalised certain assumptions are made about the financial aspects of the proposals.</p>	<p>The take up and pricing of season tickets and enforcement costs will determine whether the scheme is self financing. These will not be known until after the scheme is implemented.</p>	<p>Take account of the benefits of economy of scale in terms of enforcement.</p>	
FINANCE AND RESOURCES	<p>Implications in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Constraints • Funding • Contractual Obligations or Penalties • Use of Land or Assets 	<p>This proposal can be met within existing budget limits.</p>			<p>No significant opportunities.</p>
LEGAL	<p>Implications in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory or 	<p>No significant risks.</p>			<p>No significant opportunities.</p>

Impact	Description	Potential Risks	Comments	Potential Opportunities	Comments
	discretionary powers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Legislation (e.g. Human Rights, Data protection etc) • Failing to comply with legislative requirements of service • Potential litigation action 				
PERSONNEL	Implications in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational change • Employee policies and conditions • Skill availability • Training and Development 	No significant risks.		No significant opportunities.	
SERVICE	Implications in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performance targets • the operation of the service • the need for Change Management • Competitive advantage of the service • Technological impacts • Innovation • The needs of residents, businesses or visitors to the Borough 	Long stay parking problems could be transferred to streets immediately outside the town centre review area.	It is inevitable that there will be some transfer of parking.	The proposals if implemented will address parking problems experienced by some residents in the town centre.	
HEALTH & SAFETY	Implications for the Health & Safety of the Public, Employees or Members	No significant risks.		No significant opportunities.	
CRIME & DISORDER	Implications in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council's Section 17 Obligations • Community Safety 	No significant risks.		No significant opportunities.	

Impact	Description	Potential Risks	Comments	Potential Opportunities	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anti-fraud and corruption 				
ENVIRONMENTAL	Implications in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability • Public Health • Physical risks 	No significant risks.		The proposals could encourage car sharing and greater use of public transport.	
EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY	Implications in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion • Equality of access and opportunity • Cohesion • Diversity 	Arrangements for blue badge holders may not entirely meet their needs.	Residents have been consulted and will be consulted on further proposals. All sectors of the community will be able to comment. An equality impact assessment is being drafted.	No significant opportunities.	