

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 59
Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Parking Control
Date of Meeting: 23 March 2009
Report of: Jenny Rowlands, Director of Environment
Contact Officer: Name: Christina Liassides Tel: 292036
E-mail: Christina.liassides@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Key Decision: Yes/No Forward Plan No. 7 *Digit Ref:*
Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 This report sets out Brighton & Hove City Council's agreed strategy and policies for parking schemes. Other forms of parking controls, such as double yellow lines, single lines or designated bays such as disabled bays, are usually installed in response to individual issues, such as safety concerns on junctions and are not utilised as an area-wide form of parking control.
- 1.2 This report is separate to information about the enforcement aspect of parking schemes; it sets out what happens in order for a parking scheme to be considered and implemented.
- 1.3 The strategy, principles and policies have been approved by members and put in place over several years based on national legislation and guidance, expanding and up-to-date experience of parking issues and professional officer opinion.
- 1.4 As a result, the council has built up an extremely comprehensive level of guidance and policy which enable Brighton & Hove City Council to act consistently with regard to the introduction and enforcement of parking controls.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 To note the report and attached appendices and to make any recommendations arising out of this.
- 2.2 That Members consider the draft policy at Appendix E and make comments to be taken into account by the Cabinet Member.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 Parking schemes seek to maximise the available on-street parking space whilst ensuring that safety and traffic flows are not compromised. This is achieved by careful design which balances the needs of vehicle users in a specific area – residents, commuters, visitors, amenity users, shoppers – and encourages turn-over of vehicles using the available space.
- 3.2 Like many historical cities, Brighton & Hove is mainly comprised of streets that were not originally designed for motorised vehicles, which now need to accommodate increasing car ownership alongside high density living (e.g. houses converted to flats). The available on-street road space is geographically and topographically limited and comes under competing pressures from through traffic and parked vehicles. There is very little off-street parking in many areas of the city, particularly the more central areas.
- 3.3 Parking schemes can only work within the available road space, so they cannot create “extra” space within historically narrow streets. However, their main benefit is the regulation of the space, which maximises turn-over of vehicles, gives priority to residents and tackles illegal or inconsiderate parking.
- 3.4 An area is only considered for the parking scheme consultation timetable if there has been enough representation from residents, ward councillors and others within the area asking for parking controls. This usually happens when the available road space is no longer sufficient for all the competing parking needs. The council does not impose schemes on areas – schemes are only introduced after careful consultation through several stages and if the consultation returns a negative vote, the council will not proceed with a scheme.
- 3.5 Inevitably, a scheme in one area may displace vehicles to an adjacent area. This, combined with increased car ownership, the historical limitations within the city and additional generators of parking need such as new developments, have led more areas across the city to petition for schemes.
- 3.6 There are now 13 controlled parking zones in Brighton & Hove, with a further 2 under consultation and another 2 areas being investigated. The earliest forms of paid controlled parking began in the Brighton Old Town in the 1960s. Brighton & Hove was one of the first authorities to introduce Decriminalised Parking Enforcement in July 2001 and proceeded to introduce parking zones with consistent controls and tariffs, starting in Central Hove.
- 3.7 In 1997, Brighton & Hove City Council agreed a policy which set out the criteria for Residents Parking Schemes. This includes the need to consider areas on a sequential basis, where there is the greatest parking demand and where the majority of residents are in favour. Schemes must also be self-financing and incorporate a mix of resident-only and shared or separate pay & display bays. (See Appendix A)

- 3.8 In July 2004, a strategy on residents' (controlled) parking schemes was presented to Environment Committee, and a report on parking charges was presented to Policy & Resources Committee. These reports set out the importance of consistency in all zones and outlined the types of permits available and the criteria for issuing these. (See Appendix B). The Environment Committee report contained a timetable of areas requesting schemes.
- 3.9 In May 2005, Environment Committee agreed the council's policy for issuing permits.
- 3.10 In December 2005, a report was presented to and agreed by Environment Committee outlining the areas requesting schemes and laying out the priority timetable. At this stage, every parking scheme was undergoing a review/extension after 6 months of operation, which could take a year to two years.
- 3.11 A long-standing aim of the council was to review the central Brighton area, where there were 8 zones of differing sizes with different operational regulations, and to replace voucher parking with Pay & Display. Additionally, a main aim was to review the Area H (Royal Sussex Hospital) scheme. These were major undertakings during 2005-07 that have resulted in noticeable improvements for residents and visitors particularly in the central city area.
- 3.12 During this time, it became apparent that the timetable for other schemes was slipping, and that the consequence of reviewing every newly established scheme was resulting in incremental extensions in some areas which took resources away from other geographical areas that had been on the list for some time. It also became apparent that small incremental extensions, especially light-touch schemes, caused knock-on displacement effects to adjacent neighbourhoods that were not on the agreed timetable and for which there were no allocated resources.
- 3.13 As a result, a new strategy was presented to and agreed by Environment Committee in November 2006, as part of the consideration of the Central Brighton review. This strategy removed the requirement to review all new/existing schemes on a regular basis, and re-constituted the timetable to take into account bigger geographical areas, with the aim of minimising incremental displacement.
- 3.14 A further review in January 2008 was undertaken by Environment Committee following representation from residents in areas of the city that were suffering the greatest parking pressures and conflicts. This report analysed the parking capacity in four main areas, summarised parking scheme strategy and policy to date and set out a new timetable. An important factor was ensuring that adequate resources were devoted to each area and that timescales allowed for extensive consultation. (See Appendix C).
- 3.15 Environment Committee also agreed the use of consultants to increase capacity and bring all areas forward as much as possible. A copy of the agreed timetable is attached at Appendix D.

- 3.16 In March 2008, Environment Committee considered and agreed a report on the Preston Park station/Stanford ward/Preston Park Avenue areas under consultation. This report explored the problematic issues arising from “light” touch schemes and extensive single yellow line controls, principally the displacement effect for any vehicles except residents’, and proposed that no further such schemes were introduced in the city. (See Appendix E).
- 3.17 The existing “light” touch schemes (Area U near Queen’s Park and Area W in Hove) will be reviewed with a view to converting these to full shared schemes. The reviews will take place as part of the Hanover/Elm Grove/Queen’s Park work starting in 2009 and as part of the Portslade/West Hove work starting in 2010.
- 3.18 A new policy has been drawn up drawing on the various elements agreed by Committee over the last few years, and on professional officer expertise built up during 8 years of in-house delivery of schemes. The policy is attached at Appendix F for consideration by this Panel. This policy is still in draft form. The aim is to present the next batch of Highway policies, including this one, to Cabinet or Cabinet Member meeting in September 2009.

Budget

- 3.19 The cost of all the consultation, physical works and consultancy for parking schemes are borrowed against future income.
- 3.20 The approximate total cost per scheme is £730,000. This is based on a geographical area roughly the size of most existing schemes, and includes all data surveys, public consultation, consultants’ costs, preparation and advertising of relevant documents, signage, lining and Pay & Display machine purchase and installation. For example, the cost of a Pay & Display machine is £3,500.
- 3.21 Approximate repayment costs, based on an estimated £730,000 per scheme, would be £130,000 per year per scheme over 7 years. As the council works on at least 2 schemes per year at the moment, the minimum repayment costs per year are £260,000 if the schemes are agreed. In 2009/10, 4 potential schemes will be in various stages of progress.
- 3.22 There are ongoing costs once a parking scheme is in place. These include the running and maintenance of each scheme – for example, P&D tickets cost £2,000 per annum to provide, whilst signing and lining needs to be regularly maintained or refreshed. Permits are issued annually and there are printing and staffing costs associated with these.
- 3.23 For a scheme to work effectively it needs robust enforcement. Enforcement has an estimated total cost of £3.7 million per year for all the schemes. Permit income is estimated at £3.6 million for the coming year.

- 3.24 Permit income is just one small part of the income received from parking schemes. Additional income from Pay & Display machines and Penalty Charge Notices all contribute towards the overall cost of the parking schemes. "Light" touch schemes cost more to implement and enforce than they generate in revenue.
- 3.25 Any surplus from parking schemes is governed by section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended from October 2004 by section 95 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. This states that Civil Parking Enforcement surplus may only be used for specific purposes, such as off-setting the costs of providing council on or off street parking or for the purposes of highway, road, local amenity or environmental pollution improvement projects.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Each individual parking scheme is implemented after staged consultation within the local area, including the formal Traffic Regulation Order.
- 4.2 Parking strategy and policies have been presented to Policy & Resources and Environment Committee on a regular basis.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 Revenue:
There are no direct financial implications associated with this report. The full cost of advertising traffic regulation orders and amending lining and signing for existing parking schemes is met within existing revenue budgets. The financial impact of revenue from any proposed new schemes is included within the budget for the appropriate year

Capital:

There are no direct capital implications associated with this report. New parking schemes are funded through unsupported borrowings with approximate repayment costs of £130,000 per scheme over 7 years.

Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw Date: 18/02/2009

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 In contemplating new and in the revisions of existing schemes as well as the provision of other forms of parking controls the Council's powers and duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of

traffic, the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway and any other matters appearing relevant to the council.

At this stage there does not appear to be any human rights implications but in the event that any are identified when the strategies, principles and policies in this report are implemented they will be dealt with in a subsequent report.

Lawyer Consulted: Stephen Dryden

Date: 18/02/2009

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 The provision of robust parking enforcement provides more opportunities for Blue Badge holders to find convenient parking spaces. The easing of pressure on road space will also benefit those who walk, cycle and travel by bus.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 This scheme accords with the Council's Sustainable Transport Strategy by balancing the needs of all sections of the community and giving priority to residents whilst ensuring management of available spaces for other vehicle users.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 The provision of improved and consistent parking controls and enforcement reduces the incidence of illegal parking.

Risk & Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 There is a risk of displacement to nearby non-controlled areas when new schemes are introduced.
- 5.7 There is a risk that schemes will not be delivered to schedule, particularly if resources are diverted away from the agreed timetable.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.8 The council is committed to reducing pollution and congestion around the city. Improved and consistent parking controls and enforcement help address some of these issues within the city.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 This report supplies an overview to current parking controls and enforcement, and presents the revised draft Parking Scheme Assessment policy for consideration. Alternative options are therefore not applicable.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The revised draft policy summarises all previous policies and strategy. ECSOSC is an important part of the consultation process.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A – BHCC Policy HP 4-15: Resident Parking Schemes Assessment and Charges
2. Appendix B – section from Environment Committee 1 July 2004 – Development of Residents' Parking Schemes
3. Appendix C –summary of parking scheme strategy from Environment Committee 24 January 2008 – Parking Scheme Implementation Overview
4. Appendix D – current timetable as approved by Environment Committee 24 January 2008
5. Appendix E – section on light-touch parking schemes from Environment Committee 20 March 2008
6. Appendix F – draft new policy on Resident Parking Schemes Assessment

Documents In Members' Rooms

1. None

Background Documents

1. Environment Committee – 1 July 2004 – Development of Residents' Parking Schemes
2. Policy & Resources Committee – 21 July 2004 – Review of Parking Charges & Methods of Payment
3. Environment Committee – 8 December 2005 – Review of Parking Programme
4. Environment Committee – 26 November 2006 – Central Brighton On Street Parking Review
5. Environment Committee – 24 January 2008 – Parking Scheme Implementation Overview
6. Environment Committee – 20 March 2008 – Parking Schemes Initial Consultation Results