

**ECSOSC Informal Workshop: Citywide Parking Review
4pm Tuesday 6 December 2011. Kings House R122**

Present: Councillors Warren Morgan (Chair) Ollie Sykes (Deputy Chair), Leo Littman, Denise Cobb, Tony Janio and Anne Pissaridou (sub)

- a) Councillor Warren Morgan, ECSOSC Chair welcomed everyone to the second workshop on the citywide parking review and referred to the Project Manager Owen McElroy's (OM) update.
- b) Councillor Morgan was concerned that the Parking Tariff Review as agreed by 29 November 2011 CMM was a significant policy change. The decision impacted on the work of this scrutiny workshop and should have been a part of the citywide parking review. It may cause unintended consequences but scrutiny had no opportunity to comment on it. Members generally agreed that the workshop was expecting to work more in tandem with the development of the administration's emerging review of parking policy. This would be raised with the Cabinet Member.
- c) OM noted the main issues from the first workshop, and initial proposals for consultation or development regarding these. Workplace parking levies were being looked at; however a suitable number of parking places had to be available in the right places to enable this approach, he added.
- d) Councillor Cobb was disappointed that her idea at the first workshop for a citywide parking scheme did not seem to have been fully followed up. The workshop asked that the citywide parking review include scope for completely new ideas rather than merely adapting existing provision. *[Councillor Cobb's suggestion has been circulated and Councillor Cobb has received an officer reply]*
- e) OM set out plans for the consultation on the citywide parking review. Visits to LATs were being arranged as listed and Community Engagement training had provided new ideas and information on methods and groups for consultation. Some areas of the City were under-represented at present as regards engagement with their LATs on the parking review and **Members were asked to contact OM with suggestions for consultations with LATs and other interested groups.**
- f) Asked for more information on the consultation process, OM said LATs and community groups were being involved, also Ward Members, disability groups, officers and other external stakeholders. There would be a press release and development of a web page plus a postal questionnaire during the summer for which officers were being advised on the timing and notice period, and the timetable for receiving and analysing responses. The questions asked, the design and extent of the questionnaire would be key. For general opinions, randomised samples could be used but for consultation on a specific scheme, all households would need to receive a questionnaire. The potential for displacement parking was now included in all parking consultations.
- g) All Ward Councillors would be asked to provide a list of consultee organisations if they wished, from now until the end of March 2012.
- h) (The web-based consultation on cumulative impact licensing area was described by a Member as difficult to use/navigate, so that some would-be respondents gave up and did

not reply.)

i) Members asked questions. **(Further information provided in brackets)**

- o what is the legal position on parking penalty charges in instances when the ‘correct’ fee has been paid, albeit for a different zone of the City.

(The traffic order has a definition of a tariff area and stipulates that a ticket purchased in one tariff area cannot be used in another tariff area. CEOs are trained to look for this. However there is nothing in the traffic order to prevent transferability within the same tariff zone e.g. buying a ticket in a low tariff street in Area R and then using it in another low tariff street e.g. in Area H. This is not widely known by the public or even by officers.)

- o what is the tendering timetable and process for the parking enforcement contract currently with NSL.

(This is set out set out on the minutes of Cabinet 8 December 2011 Agenda item 147 para 3.10:

OJEU Placed	Jan 2012
Evaluate PQQs	March 2012
Invitation to Tender sent out	April 2012
Evaluation of Tenders	May / June 2012
Award Contract	August 2012
Mobilisation	August – December 2012
Contract Start	1 st January 2013

- o are parking permits available for family carers, as well as professional carers?

(Parking permits are available for family carers. These are called carers permits. We could also issue these to friends who care for someone within the CPZ.

Terms of issue: A ‘Carers’ permit can be applied for if a ‘carer’ has to visit a resident or residents who need to be cared for by virtue of age, physical or mental infirmity, as well as women requiring antenatal and/or postnatal care. Please answer the following questions so that we can assess whether you are eligible for a Carers Permit.

The GP of the person being cared for needs to sign a declaration stating:

“I confirm the person named and living at the address in section D is suffering from physical and/or mental infirmity or having ante- and/or post natal treatment, and is assisted by a Carer.”)

j) Contact officers Paul Nichols and Austen Hunter can provide more detailed information on current transport operations and the tendering process for the parking enforcement contract. (phone numbers 29 - 2245 and 29 - 3287)

k) The workshop discussed how ‘internal’ commuting by car could best be reduced and asked for more information on the ‘demographics’ of car ownership and usage, the current

allocation criteria for resident permits and the definition of a household in relation to this. It was thought likely that residents would be influenced in where they live by the availability/cost of parking; reduced car ownership in the City centre could potentially result in additional pressure on car parking spaces in the suburbs.

(Attached are statistical reports of car ownership/demographical information taken from the 2001 census and the report on Personalised Travel Planning (PTP) data from the West of the City 2006- 10. The census data is broken down into wards; note that the census data is now ten years out of date.

(The PTP data shows that rates of car ownership and usage have been in decline in the West of the City except the Withdean and Preston Park area and the Wish and Westbourne areas. However the data must be treated with caution as the return rates varied between the areas and no control group was used for comparison. This data is also up to six years old.)

l) Members noted that maximum vehicle height restrictions means that small businesses' vans had to park outside parking zones to avoid blocking ground floor windows. This reduced the take-up of permits, and increased displacement. Parking displacement of any kind was difficult to avoid.

m) The workshop suggested ideas for consideration as part of the citywide parking consultation:

- a) Removing all parking zones altogether
- b) Encouraging motorcycles actively eg by providing extra motorcycle parking spaces, allowing motorcycles to use bus lanes
- c) Introducing parking charge 'holidays'
- d) Enabling permits to be purchased for neighbouring zones especially where take-up of resident permits was lower than anticipated; (this was unlikely to be feasible and may open the Council to Ombudsman challenge. **(see note below*)** A trial was being proposed in Zones M and N
- e) Re-visiting the merits and disadvantages of 'light touch' parking schemes
- f) Allowing a trading system for parking permits, with the number of permits available being reduced year by year.
- g) Graduated parking fees according to vehicle dimensions/characteristics (allowing for a lead-in time to encourage changes in patterns of vehicle purchasing)
- h) Introducing transferable vehicle permits for use by small garages in residential areas
- i) Underground parking
- j) Encouraging cycling with secure spaces for bicycles
- k) Supporting businesses and taking account of the night-time economy as well as daytime business hours

n) The Chair Councillor Warren Morgan thanked colleagues and officers and summarised the key issues from the workshop for the consultation, to feed back to Cabinet Member. Engagement with the public, including carers' groups, was key and the timetable for the citywide parking review and implementation needed to be clear.

o) Would like the consultation on the citywide parking review from the starting point, to

Agenda Item 39 Appendix D

- Be clear on the strategic objectives of parking policy in the City
- be 'open' to encourage completely new innovative ideas from all stakeholders
- summarise the current parking problems including numerical estimates of the various users and stakeholders (eg census/demographic data, vehicle ownership and usage mapping relating to different parts of the City, trends in journeys, tourist information, use of the transport model, matching with public transport information, personal travel plans, results of NSL surveys and academic studies. Also hotspots eg hospitals, doctors, schools)
- consider how parking/car usage trends in different parts of the City may change over time eg if car use shifts significantly from the city centre towards the suburbs
- give due attention to disabled parking
- describe best practice elsewhere
- review the effects of the 'light-touch' approach, based on experience here and elsewhere
- investigate workplace parking levies

(*There is concern that allowing permits to households that do not have waiting restrictions in front of their house outside of parking schemes could open the floodgates to other roads throughout the city that are on the edge of parking zones asking for permits. Residents throughout Brighton & Hove on the edge of parking schemes could argue that if we allow residents that do not have waiting restrictions in front of their house and who do not live within a scheme to be issued permits, then the City Council will have established a precedent and their road too should also get resident permits.

(It is arguable that this could lead to residents within a parking scheme throughout Brighton & Hove making complaints that those residents who do not have parking restrictions within their area are parking within the parking scheme.

(There had been a recent complaint from a resident which had got to Ombudsman stage and the ombudsman ruled that there was no maladministration in the council's current policy in this respect.)