



OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

ON STREET PARKING REVIEW IN WAVERLEY 2011/12: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSE

16 MARCH 2012

KEY ISSUE

To consider objections and comments made in response to statutory consultation about changes to on-street parking arrangements in parts of Waverley. To decide whether to go ahead, modify or withdraw, various proposals for on-street parking.

SUMMARY

In September and December 2011 the Local Committee gave its agreement for statutory consultation about changes to on-street controls in some parts of Waverley. In many cases the proposals had been put forward by Waverley residents and councillors (County and Borough). The statutory consultation was carried out during January and February this year and the Local Committee is now asked to consider the responses and to decide on a way forward in each location.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Waverley) is asked to:

In Farnham

- a) Approve the recommendations detailed in Annex 1.
- b) Agree that the detail of the changes described by the recommendations in Annex 1 is agreed by the local member, chairman and vice chairman.

ITEM 8

- c) Agree that, where necessary, formal advertisement and further statutory consultation is completed about changes proposed in Annex 1
- d) Agree that the response to the consultation in c) is reported to the Committee in June.

In Haslemere

- e) Approve the recommendations detailed in Annex 1.
- f) Agree that the detail of the changes described by the recommendations in Annex 1 is agreed by the local member, chairman and vice chairman.
- g) Agree that, where necessary, formal advertisement and further statutory consultation is completed about changes proposed in Annex 1.
- h) Agree that the response to the consultation in g) is reported to the Committee in June.

In Godalming, Farncombe and Wormley

- i) Approve the recommendations detailed in Annex 1.
- j) Agree that the detail of the changes described by the recommendations in Annex 1 is agreed by the local member, chairman and vice chairman.
- k) Agree that, where necessary, formal advertisement and further statutory consultation is completed about changes proposed in Annex 1 and as described in section 2.11.
- l) Agree that the response to the consultation in k) is reported to the Committee in June.

In Cranleigh

- m) Approve the recommendations detailed in Annex 1.
- n) Agree that the detail of the changes described by the recommendations in Annex 1 is agreed by the local member, chairman and vice chairman.
- o) Agree that, where necessary, formal advertisement and further statutory consultation is completed about changes proposed in Annex 1.
- p) Agree that the response to the consultation in o) is reported to the Committee in June.

In general

- q) Agree that Waverley Borough Conservation officers are consulted about the locations of pay and display machines.
- r) Allocate £30,000 from the 2012/13 revenue budget toward the cost of implementing the parking review.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Surrey County Council (SCC) is the Highway Authority in Surrey and responsible for managing the highway network, including on-street parking.
- 1.2 The Local Committee (Waverley) approved a number of changes to on-street parking arrangements as part of the 2011/12 Parking Review Report on the 16 September. The Committee also agreed the principle of the introduction of parking charges in some locations at its meeting on the 16 December, subject to the results of a statutory consultation. The advertised proposals agreed at both meetings are shown on the plans in Annex 3. This report details the consultation process and the responses received to the consultation. They have been summarised in Annex 1.
- 1.3 In accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the proposed changes to parking restrictions were advertised on the 13th January for 28 days until the 10th February. A press notice was placed in the Herald (Haslemere and Farnham editions) and the Surrey Advertiser.
- 1.4 In addition, street notices were placed on all roads where changes to parking restrictions were proposed. In the cases where residents' parking schemes are planned, neighbouring properties were also letter dropped, with additional information about the proposals.
- 1.5 Documents explaining the proposals were placed on deposit at the libraries in Cranleigh, Haslemere, Godalming and Farnham, as well as at the Waverley Borough Council Offices.
- 1.6 All of the information, including drawings were available on the Surrey County Council web page, Parking News and Updates in Waverley.
- 1.7 The SCC contact centre and Parking Team were able to answer many enquiries during the consultation process.
- 1.8 On the 20th January it was necessary to place an additional notice in the press, highlighting two omissions from the main advertisement the week earlier. These were to clarify:
 - Carers would be eligible for parking permits in all residents' parking schemes in Waverley, and
 - The maximum charge for long term parking (over 5 hours) on some residential roads around Haslemere station would be £5.Unfortunately the wording on the press notice was not very clear on this; however, it was explained in some detail in other consultation documents and on the Parking News and Updates in Waverley web page from the start of the consultation on the 13th January. Based on the consultation responses, it is clear that station users who parked on-street in the area understood the proposed parking charges.

ITEM 8

- 1.9 The objection period for comments specifically about these two issues was extended by 1 week to the 17th February.
- 1.10 A petition was presented to the Local Committee on the 24th February, by Ms Julianne Evans on behalf of residents of Haslemere and the surrounding area(s), who wished to object to the parking orders published in the Haslemere Herald on 13 January 2012. The reasons cited for this objection are: they do not adequately address the parking issues in the town, particularly the large and growing problem of commuter parking; they will be disastrous for local businesses; the proposals for residents in many cases are unworkable; they will impact heavily on those living in modest houses with little or no parking and low-income workers.
- 1.11 In speaking to the petition, Ms Evans also reflected the concerns of the signatories that the consultation process had been flawed and their understanding that the exercise had been conceived as a means of raising money to cover the £0.5m deficit in enforcement costs in Surrey. They felt that inadequate evidence had been provided, that an improved enforcement of current parking restrictions had been given insufficient consideration and that proposed measures to encourage "churn" in the retail areas were unnecessary.
- 1.12 An e petition was started on the SCC website calling on Surrey County Council to abandon its proposals for on-street parking charges in and around Haslemere. There were 410 names on it by the 6th March 2012.
- 1.13 Overall there was a very strong response to the consultation. Local newspapers, BBC Surrey Radio and BBC South TV ran stories publicising the proposals, particularly in Haslemere.
- 1.14 A public meeting was held in Haslemere on the 24th January. It was well attended and a transcript made of the points of view expressed.
- 1.15 A meeting was also arranged in Haslemere High Street against the proposals to charge in retail areas.
- 1.16 Some respondents from Haslemere claimed that the consultation response was flawed and that there should be a longer consultation period.
- 1.17 In order to change parking restrictions it is necessary for a Local Authority to make (or amend) a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in compliance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The statutory minimum consultation period prior to making a TRO is 21 days, but the County Council normally extends this to 28 days for consultations in Surrey. This is typical throughout the UK where this legislation applies.
- 1.18 The formal consultation consists of placing an advert in the local newspaper, on streets where changes are proposed as well as making

detailed plans available in local libraries and on the Council's website. This gives residents and businesses adequate notice of the proposals and time to respond. Although 28 days consultation exceeds the statutory minimum, the Council will often take into account comments made outside this period or, in some cases where it has not been possible for an individual or organisation to respond in time. The purpose of the consultation is to develop proposals that provide the best outcome for residents and highway users.

- 1.19 This formal 28 day consultation period for the parking review in Waverley started with an advertisement placed in the Herald on Thursday 13th January. However, the parking management proposals in Haslemere and elsewhere have been developed over a period of many months and in this process the Council has had informal consultations and discussions with residents and other organisations in Haslemere.
- 1.20 There was a good response rate to the consultation, particularly from Haslemere, and the widespread publicity helped generate interest. Although some claimed that the process was flawed, it was not stated why, how, or in what way. There cannot be many in Haslemere who were 'unaware' of the proposals by the end of the consultation period.
- 1.21 The Local Committee approved the proposals for consultation in Waverley, to include Haslemere, in December, effectively meaning they will have been in the public domain for about 3 months from approval in December to the point where a decision is made on the way forward in March. There was therefore no basis in extending the consultation period solely for Haslemere which would also have meant separating it out and running on a different timescale, increasing costs by several thousand pounds.
- 1.22 The recommendations in this report include changes to the original proposals based on the first round of consultation. Where there is a requirement for significant change, it is proposed that there should be further consultation (statutory 28 day as before), meaning residents will be able to have their say again. In this way, it will be possible to develop the most appropriate proposals for residents and the wider community.

2 Response to the public consultation

Farnham

- 2.1 A summary of objections and comments about the planned parking restrictions in Farnham is shown in Annex 1 along with a recommendation for each location.
- 2.2 A varied range of proposals were advertised in Farnham. These included on-street parking charges, additional residents' parking provision and new restrictions for safety or traffic management reasons. There was generally support for changes to resident parking provision

and on-street charges around the town centre with the exception of Burnt Hill Road.

- 2.3 In some cases the proposals can be changed to accommodate objections. This means some further consultation before implementation.

Godalming, Farncombe, Witley and Wormley

- 2.4 There was support for most of the proposed restrictions in these areas. Comments made and recommendations about the proposals are shown in Annex 1.
- 2.5 An informal consultation was carried out in Farncombe last November following numerous requests over recent years for residents permits within the streets around the Railway Station, a potential layout for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was assessed on site, mapped out for display and presented at Committee on 16 September 2011. The layout together with a covering letter and questionnaire was then distributed to all 1073 properties that fronted the public highway during November 2011.
- 2.6 A well-attended public meeting was attended by the County Councillor and members of the parking team to listen to residents concerns.
- 2.7 This informal consultation process gave an indication of the level of support for residents' parking, including possible operational hours and likely demand for residents' parking permits in the neighbourhood.
- 2.8 468 households (43.6%) responded by the deadline of 21 November 2011. Of those 468 responses, 307 (65.6%) said changes to parking restrictions in their street were required, while 161 (34.4%) households felt no changes to existing parking restrictions were required.
- 2.9 226 (48.3%) of the 468 households that returned completed questionnaires, supported the idea of a permit scheme being introduced in the area. 242 (51.7%) households were not in favour of a permit scheme being introduced. The level of support was only about 50% in the roads where support was strongest. It was less in others.
- 2.10 Of the 1073 questionnaires distributed, 226 were returned within the time period given favouring the introduction of a controlled parking zone. This is an overall 21% response in favour and represents insufficient support to proceed to the formal advertising of this proposal.
- 2.11 Included within the proposals for the CPZ were some amendments that had been requested separately and one amendment that came out of the consultation, which should serve to alleviate problems facing residents, and which should still go ahead. These are:

ITEM 8

- in St Johns Street, change the parking bays outside 8 to 20 from a 1 hour limit to no time limit (in order to provide somewhere for residents to park throughout the day) and at the same time introduce double yellow lines across the dropped kerb between 8 and 10 (to prevent cars blocking the access);
- in Hare Lane, change the parking bays outside 26 to 28, 32 to 32a and 64 to 64c from a 1 hour limit to no time limit and introduce new or extend existing parking bays without time limit outside 18, 34 to 36 and 50 to 54 (in order to provide somewhere for residents to park throughout the day) and at the same time introduce double yellow lines across the dropped kerb outside 32 (to prevent cars blocking the access)
- in Station Road, change the parking bay which runs adjacent to the station car park from a 1 hour limit to no time limit (in order to allow all day parking and relieve some of the pressure in surrounding residential roads) except for the first 25 metres of the bay from the end opposite the entrance to North Street, where the existing restriction should remain in place

Haslemere

- 2.12 The proposals in Haslemere included managing parking more comprehensively around the station, residents parking schemes and 'pay and display' charges in the High Street and Weyhill.
- 2.13 There was widespread publicity during the consultation period. A well-attended public meeting in Haslemere Hall was chaired by the mayor of Haslemere and attended by the County Councillor and Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.
- 2.14 There was significant opposition to the proposals to introduce on-street charges into the retail areas of the High Street and Weyhill. Support was strongest for residents' parking schemes, both near the town centre and in roads around the railway station.
- 2.15 The consultation response and recommendations are shown in Annex 1.

Cranleigh

- 2.16 Two residents parking schemes were proposed in Cranleigh. The consultation response and recommendations are shown in Annex 1.

3 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

ITEM 8

- 3.1 The County Council and its enforcement partners (currently most of the District and Borough Councils) operate Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) in accordance with Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2006. The County Council is the Traffic Authority in Surrey with ultimate responsibility on street parking enforcement. The day to day enforcement of parking restrictions, however, is carried out under agreement by the district and borough councils.
- 3.2 The operational guidance for CPE states:
- ‘...However, authorities will need to bear in mind that if their scheme is not self-financing, then they need to be certain that they can afford to pay for it from within existing funding. The Secretary of State will not expect either national or local taxpayers to meet any deficit’
- 3.3 The introduction of new waiting restrictions and residents’ parking schemes has cost implications in terms of the requisite lining, enforcement and administration. The cost of administering residents’ parking schemes is covered by the income from the sale of resident parking permits
- 3.4 It is desirable to have a presence in the form of a ‘helpshop’ or ‘parking office’ within each town, to deal with enquiries about residents’ parking schemes and from where permits can be issued.
- 3.5 The introduction of new waiting restrictions increases the enforcement ‘beat’ for the Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) and means they must cover a larger area within their working day. This means that they would be unable to visit each location as frequently as the range of their patrols increases, which would tend to reduce compliance. However, as the aim of parking enforcement is to achieve as close to 100% compliance as possible, this means that additional enforcement becomes necessary.
- 3.6 The proposals in Farnham and Haslemere also include the maintenance and operation of pay and display ticket machines. Modern pay and display machines are solar powered meaning there is no need to provide a mains power supply, helping reduce installation and energy costs. CEOs are trained to be able to fix basic faults such as ticket jams.
- 3.7 It is also planned to use cashless payment alongside the pay and display ticket machines. This allows visitors to pay for parking by phone and is convenient if they do not have change on them. Pay by phone has a low set-up cost. All that is needed are signs advising the motorist of the phone number they need to call, alongside the parking place reference number. Callers are typically charged a fee for using this facility, but this will first be subject to a tender exercise, in order to seek best value for residents and the Council. A ‘pay by phone’ service helps to reduce the number of payment machines that need to be installed.

ITEM 8

- 3.8 Potential income from parking charges has been estimated to determine if it will be sufficient to cover the cost of maintaining the machines. The income is estimated by assuming occupancy levels in parking spaces and then factoring the tariff with this and the operational periods of the restrictions. This process takes into account periods when there may be no income due to road works, street markets or faults with the machines.
- 3.9 Although long-term agency enforcement agreements have not been finalised, it is anticipated that on-street parking enforcement including pay and display ticket machines will be managed day to day in Waverley by the Guildford Borough Council Parking Team.
- 3.10 Initial discussions with the Guildford Parking Team indicate that the proposals in this report will require additional enforcement and administration resources but the exact level of this will not be known until June when proposals are finalised. An estimate of the costs has, however, been given in Annex 2 but is subject to agreement based on the level of enforcement that is required.
- 3.11 The additional cost associated with enforcement and administration of the residents parking schemes, as well as estimated income is shown in Annex 2.
- 3.12 It has been conservatively calculated that a pay and display ticket machine typically costs £3000 to supply and install and another £2500 per year to maintain. This cost includes cash collections and fault fixing.
- 3.13 Overall it is possible that there could be an annual surplus of income in Waverley if the proposals in this report are introduced.
- 3.14 Legal costs to install on-street parking charges, could total £20,000 for the proposals in this report. Overall, it is anticipated that the cost of any additional enforcement required, as a result of the proposals in this report will be met by income from on-street parking charges.
- 3.15 The purchase and installation costs, will be funded from the Council's 'Invest to Save' scheme. The capital investment to install the infrastructure for on street charging will be repaid over 10 years.
- 3.16 It is proposed that the Local Committee (Waverley) allocate £30,000 from its 2012/13 revenue budget to implement the 'parking review' element of the recommendations in this report.
- 3.17 Any surplus arising from managing on street parking can only be used as defined under Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). This restricts the use of any surplus for the maintenance and/or improvement of the Highway including environmental works or additional parking provision. The Cabinet Member for Transport and the Environment has said that whilst the Cabinet has not formally decided

on the detail, that he agrees with the principle that any surplus income should be ring-fenced for transportation schemes in the area from where that surplus was derived.

4 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 An equality impact assessment has been undertaken. This has identified potential negative impacts for certain groups, especially those with a low household income. However, parking charges are small compared to the overall cost of running a motor vehicle. The proposed tariffs are reasonable when compared with off-street car park charges and should contribute to only a relatively small rise in the overall costs of running a motor vehicle. In Haslemere it is planned to provide some parking bays with a lower tariff (£2.50 instead of £5) to reduce the economic impact of the proposed parking charges.
- 4.2 Blue badge holders can park in disabled parking bays or on yellow lines for up to three hours and are exempt from charges.
- 4.3 Carers' Permits are those issued to either carers employed by a private firm where the carers are not medically qualified but do assist the resident with vital household tasks such as dressing, etc. Other family members who assist a resident in this way are also eligible. In this case the permit is issued to the resident and not the carer and the permit is only valid for use in the street (in some cases nearby neighbouring streets) where the resident lives.
- 4.4 The impact on minority, disadvantaged, vulnerable and socially excluded groups is likely to be minimal. Paying for parking on-street is not a new phenomenon (it is just not widespread in Surrey) and most drivers will have encountered it previously either at locations where it already exists in Surrey or at locations outside the county. Although some users may have difficulties using pay and display machines, providing pay by phone as an alternative should help minimise those issues, as should careful consideration of the structure and location of the pay and display machines.

5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The County Council has the necessary legal powers to operate parking enforcement through the Traffic Management Act 2006 and introduce or amend orders to designate parking bays and introduce parking charges through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 5.2 The legal mechanism for introducing on street parking charges is through an order made under sections 45 and/or 46(1A) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).

5.3 Any surplus generated from managing on-street parking can only be used as defined under Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). This restricts use of any surplus for the maintenance and/or improvement of the Highway including environmental works or additional parking provision.

6 CONCLUSION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Charging for parking helps the County and Borough Council effectively and efficiently manage on street parking in Surrey and has the following benefits:

- 'Pay and display' makes short term parking easier to enforce and helps improves turnover of the available parking space making retail areas more accessible and helping local businesses.
- Free on street and 'pay and display' off-street parking encourages drivers to look for on street parking and increases congestion and CO² emissions in town centres.
- A policy of setting higher charges for on-street 'premium' spaces also encourages drivers to go straight to a car park, reducing congestion.
- A reduction in free parking encourages alternative modes of travel to the motorcar.
- Blue badge holders would be exempt from the charges where appropriate.

6.2 The introduction of parking controls can help improve road safety and reduce obstructive parking.

7 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

7.1 Where identified further consultation will be carried out on the recommendations in this report and the response reported back to the Local Committee in June for decision on how to proceed.

LEAD OFFICER: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 0300 200 1003

E-MAIL: parking@surreycc.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 0300 200 1003

E-MAIL: parking@surreycc.gov.uk