

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 28 JANUARY 2020****REPORT OF: MR MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS****LEAD OFFICER: GILL STEWARD, INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR COMMUNITY PROTECTION, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT****SUBJECT: ON STREET PARKING STRATEGY REVIEW****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To approve changes to the county councils on street parking strategy in order to take account of changes to national legislation, new technology, environmental considerations and to reduce dangerous parking and help keep traffic moving on Surrey roads.

Update the council's range of fees and charges for parking permits and on street parking related services.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The cabinet is asked to agree that:

1. Local and Joint Committees should consider as part of the parking review process the introduction of on-street parking charges where appropriate to help improve access to retail areas or other facilities.
2. Where there is no parking surplus or other funding source to contribute towards a parking review, proposals in the review will be limited to dealing with road safety and obstruction problems rather than parking schemes.
3. We advertise our intention, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make the following changes to on street parking permits:
 - a. Amend the charge for the first resident permit issued to a household from £50 to £80.
 - b. Amend the charge for 2nd and subsequent resident permits issued to a household from £75 currently to:
 - 2nd permit charge £100
 - 3rd and subsequent permit charge £130
 - c. The maximum charge for visitor permits can be set at £3 per day where it is considered appropriate by local or joint committees. (Note: the £2 daily charge remains the default)
 - d. We introduce a 2 hour visitor permit, to be available in all permit schemes, costing £1 (see recommendation e. for annual eligibility limits)
 - e. Greater discretion is given to district and borough enforcement teams (and local/joint committees) to set annual visitor permit limits as particular

circumstances allow. The maximum however should be set at 150 for daily permits or 250 for 2 hour permits per household per year.

- f. Carers permits (as described in annex 1) will be issued for free (currently £10 per year, permits for medical and care professionals remain free)
 - g. There is no change to our current policy of assessing and providing disabled bays free of charge.
 - h. We introduce a child care permit (as described in annex 1) at the same rate as a resident permit, the charge dependent on how many resident permits had been issued to the property.
 - i. The statutory notice includes the intention of the council to increase the charge for annual resident parking permits by £4 every 2 years for 6 years.
4. Following the statutory advertisement of changes described above, the decision to implement the changes is delegated to the Head of Highways & Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways.
 5. Paper permits to be phased out by 2021 with a shift to 'virtual permits' to reduce waste and improve convenience.
 6. New residential developments built within the boundaries of existing permit parking schemes (or CPZ's) should not automatically qualify for resident permits. Eligibility should be determined by a local/joint committee in a parking review or by the Cabinet Member for Highways.
 7. The following changes to charges made for suspensions and waivers are introduced from April 2020:
 - a. The initial charge for a suspension (valid for up to 3 days) is changed from £65 to £75
 - b. The charge for each additional day that the suspension is in force is changed from £10 to £12
 - c. The initial charge for a parking waiver (valid for up to 3 days) is changed from £15 to £25
 - d. The charge for each additional day that a parking waiver is granted is changed from £5 to £6
 8. A persistent evader policy is developed and trialled with district and borough enforcement teams that will entail immobilisation or removal of persistent evader vehicles (those whose owners evade payment of parking fines) and that the approval of the final policy is delegated to the Cabinet Member for Highways.
 9. From April 2020 introduce a charge of £50 to assess an application for a new Access Protection Marking (APM) or the extension of an existing one and a charge of £120 to provide a new APM (if the application is successful), or to refresh or extend an existing one.
 10. Red routes can be used in appropriate locations (following national guidance) and enforced by camera if needed to improve flow of traffic,
 11. Cameras are used on a trial basis to enforce certain restrictions such as school keep clears to improve safety outside schools. A policy on future use of camera

enforcement of parking and other restrictions will be developed and approval sought by the Cabinet Member for Highways in due course.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Surrey County Council (on street) Parking Strategy was adopted in 2011 and sets out our policies about on-street parking regulation and enforcement. It has evolved and developed in the years since and it is now time for a more comprehensive update to ensure it is in alignment with the Community vision 2030 and changes in national legislation. The relevant ambitions of our 2030 vision are outlined below.

Residents live in clean, safe and green communities where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities. The proposals in this report include changes to resident permits that will encourage the use of off street parking thus freeing up road space. Setting increasing charges for multiple permit applications could encourage fewer multi permit applications from a single household (although allowing for this eventuality). Other proposals include ways of improving safety outside schools with camera enforcement of school keep clears and reducing antisocial pavement parking. On street Electric Vehicle (EV) charging trials are also planned to commence in 2020 in parts of the county to evaluate how this evolving technology might be made more widely available and so encourage the use of electric vehicles.

Businesses in Surrey thrive. Regular parking reviews help keep pace with changes to the wider built environment and the introduction of improved limited waiting facilities near shops and businesses will improve access to them for customers and deliveries.

Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer. Regular parking reviews can keep on top of obstructive parking issues and new powers to introduce red routes and camera enforcement can help improve traffic flow and safety. We will lobby the government to bring in legislation to make 'footway obstruction' a civil offence that can be enforced under CPE.

By 2030 we want Surrey to be a uniquely special place where everyone has a great start to life, people live healthy and fulfilling lives, are able to achieve their full potential and contribute to their community and no one is left behind. The provision of free disabled parking bays, medical permits and, carers permits will help improve the mobility of disabled residents as well as access to more vulnerable residents who are in need of care by medical staff or relatives. More flexible visitor permit arrangements will improve access arrangements for some residents.

This policy update also looks at the range of charges we or our enforcement agents make for various parking services in light of the Fees and Charges Policy adopted by Cabinet on the 18 December 2018. A key principal of this is that users of discretionary services are expected to pay for the full cost of the service being received rather than it being supplemented/paid for by the general tax payer.

DETAILS:

1. The discussion and reasoning behind the recommendations of this report is contained in Annex 1.

2. Our Parking Strategy, first adopted in 2011 has been updated in line with the recommendations of this report and supported by the discussion in Annex 1. The new 'Surrey On Street Parking Strategy' is contained in Annex 2.
3. The strategy recognises that to realise the vision for parking, work will be channelled through three main areas:
 - Manage on street parking space to ensure optimum use through our parking review process
 - Operation of civil parking enforcement – fair and cost effective with greater use of technology to achieve compliance
 - Promotion of parking controls that can help improve sustainable and greener transport and communities.
4. Partnership working with boroughs and district councils will be particularly important in the development and delivery of some policies identified in this report, given their role in the administration of civil parking enforcement and off street car parks. Boroughs and districts also work with the county council in their capacity as local planning authorities to develop standards for new development, which can affect parking provision and travel choices.
5. Although our current parking strategy was adopted as part of the Surrey Transport Plan in 2011, this update is intended to build on the original strategy and this report consequently discusses new aspects to our parking policies (Refer to Annex 1 for discussion on changes) in the following areas:
 - Parking Reviews
 - Permit Parking Schemes (aka resident parking schemes)
 - Resident permits
 - Visitor permits
 - Carer and medical permits
 - Business permits
 - Permits for new developments
 - Motorcycles
 - Suspensions and waivers on parking restrictions
 - Vehicle immobilisation
 - Disabled Bays
 - Access Protection Markings (APM)
 - Footway and verge parking
 - Parking charges
 - Red routes
 - Camera enforcement outside school
6. Policies relating to EV charging and Car Club parking bay provision are being developed separately and will link to the main parking strategy when complete.

CONSULTATION:

7. The changes to parking permits outlined in the recommendations section will require an amendment to our parking traffic regulation orders governing the current arrangements. This means we will need to place a statutory notice in newspapers circulating across the county stating our intention to make the changes described, followed by a 21 day (minimum) period for objections and representations.
8. It is proposed that the Head of Highways and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways is delegated authority to review any objections made in this period before confirming the decision.
9. District and Borough Councils in Surrey have been consulted and in some cases helped develop proposals in this report and will further participate in the development of specific policies identified.
10. The proposals were considered by the Communities, Environment and Transport Select Committee on the 19 September 2019, they resolved:

‘That the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee endorse the parking proposals contained within the report and urge Local Committees when looking at on street parking charges to consider the matter with caution in light on local opinion, likely impact of displacement parking and cost of enforcement.’
11. There were no specific recommendations by the Local Committee Chairs Group when they met to discuss the proposals on the 19 November 2019.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

Resident Permits

12. There is a risk of negative publicity, in fact it is quite likely, when we carry out the statutory process to amend the parking permit charges. The increased charge for a single parking permit will rise from £50 to £80 primarily because the charge has not changed since 2011 and it now takes more account of enforcement costs (it is not cost effective to make annual or even bi-annual smaller inflationary increases because of the costs involved in statutory process of amending countywide traffic orders, see below). The permit charge is now a fairer reflection of the true cost of providing, maintaining and enforcing a typical permit parking scheme.
13. In the statutory process we should explain how the permit charge has been developed and how it still represents good value ie £1.54 per week for the convenience of parking closer to home and not competing with commuters and shoppers for the same parking spaces. Residents expect enforcement and this should also be explained.

Access Protection Markings

14. Introducing a charge for these discretionary road markings may result in fewer applications for them, we will evaluate demand and management of this service at the end of 2020/21 financial year. (Refer to Annex 1 for more information)

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

15. Two key principals of the new Fees and Charges Policy adopted by Cabinet on the 18 December 2018 are:
- Users of discretionary services are expected to pay for the full cost of the service being received rather than the general tax payer
 - Approval for services to be provided at subsidy or the provision of concessions must follow the governance set out in the policy and align with corporate priorities
16. Fees and charges must be set to recover our costs and not to make a 'profit' but they can include our overall costs including overheads etc. However, authorities are under a duty (Local Government Act 2003) to ensure that, taking one year with another, the income from charges do not exceed the costs of provision.
17. The direct cost of changing resident and visitor permits is approximately £40,000 plus officer time. This is due to the requirement to place a statutory advert in local papers covering the whole county. This will be met from our 20% share of the CPE surplus, split between the current and next financial years. District and Borough Councils will also need to change documents and web pages in line with the changes.
18. The resident permit charge was set in 2011 to recover administration costs but does not now fully recover the true administration, maintenance or enforcement costs of these schemes. The proposed £80 charge has been calculated taking a typical resident parking scheme into account, however schemes will vary in enforcement needs from town to town. Local Committees can set higher charges if it is necessary in some locations where enforcement costs might be higher.
19. Currently income from resident permits is approximately £550,000 countywide. The district and borough councils who manage the permit schemes around the county collect the income which feeds into each on street parking account. Total income from visitor permits is approximately £250,000 and business permits £80,000 countywide.
20. As mentioned above taking into account advertising, legal and administrative support it would cost approximately £40,000 to amend the county wide permit charge so it does not make financial sense to do it too regularly. A 5% increase in resident permit income would only increase annual revenue by £27,000.
21. To ensure that the permit charge is maintained roughly in line with inflation for the next few years and to avoid regular statutory advertising costs described above it is proposed to increase the annual permit charges by £4 every 2 years (approximately 2.5% per year), starting in April 2022 and continuing until April 2026. This will also ensure smaller more predictable price increases for residents and permit holders during this period.

22. The majority of the fees and charges (resident and visitor permits etc) are collected by our enforcement agents, the district and borough councils. The income goes into the on street parking account to offset the costs of operating Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) for a given area. If there is a surplus from operating CPE, as set out in the agency agreements and the previous Cabinet parking enforcement paper of January 2018, it is split:
- 60% to the Local or Joint Committee
 - 20% to the District or Borough Council (Enforcement Agent)
 - 20% to SCC for maintenance of parking infrastructure
23. By law any parking surplus generated must be used in accordance with S55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) which generally includes parking, highway improvement/maintenance or environmental improvements in the public realm.
24. Recommendations in this report will limit parking reviews to dealing with safety and obstruction issues only where it is not possible to contribute parking surplus in any given district.
25. The table below shows the estimated changes in income due to the policy changes highlighted in this report.

	Existing Income (Countywide)	Possible change in income (countywide)	Notes
Resident Permits	£550,000	+£250,000	First permit to change from £50 to £80 to reflect full maintenance/enforcement costs for schemes since 2011. Second permit charges increased from £75 to £100/£130 to deter multiple applications.
Visitor permits	£250,000	+£35,000	2 hour permits introduced for £1 and all day 'town centre' permits for £3.
Carer and medical permits	£10,000	-£6,000	Carer permits will be free
Business permits	£80,000	£0	These can be introduced into permit schemes when they are implemented but there is no change to the proposed charge of between £150 and £500 for permits
Suspensions and waivers	£200,000	+£40,000	Revised fees updated since 2011
Immobilisation	0	0	Likely to break even if implemented. Trials to take place to evaluate.
Disabled bays	0	0	No change
APM's	0	+£15,000	Difficult to estimate, however each application will be self-financing.
Footway Parking	0	0	Does not create income
Parking Charges	£1,200,000	0	No change expected as a result of this policy.

Red Routes	0	0	None proposed at present.
Camera enforcement of SKC's	0	0	Trials will be needed to evaluate costs etc however the financial target would be to break even.
Total	£2,280,000	£334,000	

26. APM's and disabled bays are provided by the Surrey parking team rather than the district teams. Any income from APM's would come to direct to the county council rather than through individual area parking accounts.

SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY

27. Although significant progress has been made over the last twelve months to improve the Council's financial position, the medium term financial outlook is uncertain as it is heavily dependent on decisions made by Central Government. With no clarity on these beyond 2020/21, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade. This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority in order to ensure stable provision of services in the medium term. As such, the Section 151 Officer supports the recommended changes to the Council's on street parking strategy, including changes to permits, which will be factored into the Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER

28. In order to change the charge for a parking permit and/or create new, or amend existing, parking restrictions, it is necessary to amend Traffic Regulation Orders. That involves a statutory consultation/advertising in accordance with the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and associated regulations. This legislation requires that Surrey County Council places a notice in newspapers circulating where the changes are proposed, and in the case of changing permit charges across the whole of the county, describing the proposals. There are associated advertising and display provisions and also a requirement to allow for objections to be made in response to the consultation/advertisement. A public inquiry is possible in relation to unresolved objections, and this is a compulsory requirement where loading/unloading is affected by the proposals or there is an objection from a bus operator, and the relevant objections have not been withdrawn. Otherwise the need to hold an inquiry is discretionary.
29. The Council has power in section 75 of the Highways Act 1980, in relation to highways maintainable at public expense comprising both a footway or footways and a carriageway, to vary the relative widths of the carriageway and any footway

30. Red routes are now permitted as a result of changes to the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.
31. Fees and charges should be set to recover the cost of providing the service or to achieve other transportation objectives. It is not permissible to set charges that are solely intended to meet expenditure plans or fund transport strategies.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

32. An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been prepared under the Equalities Act 2010. The assessment considered that proposals in this report could positively impact younger, older and, (by association) carers who may benefit from new child care permit and the removal of the £10 fee for a carer permit.
33. Socio-economic disadvantage was also considered in the assessment. Resident permit charges are planned to increase but they still represent a small portion of the total cost of running a motor vehicle. (£50 per year equates to £4.16 per month rising to £6.67 per month) A permit charge of £80 is good value compared to providing an off street parking space in a car park or creating a new driveway. Changes to carer permits (which will be free) and visitor permits (cheaper short stay options) will make them more flexible offering lower costs for many.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

34. The parking strategy update proposals in this report are in themselves generally neutral in terms of their environmental impact but can be used (along with a range of other parking controls) as tools and mechanisms to help a transport authority achieve its travel and environmental objectives as part of local travel plans and transport initiatives.
35. On street Electric Vehicle (EV) charging trials will help shape our approach to this new and evolving technology to help develop the right environmental approach for the future.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

36. If agreed the next steps are:
 - a. In early March we will place a statutory notice in newspapers circulating around the county starting a 28 consultation period concerning changes to permit charges described in the report. Information about the changes will also be made available to via our web pages.
 - b. The Head of Highways and Transport and Cabinet Member for Highways will review objections and representations to the proposals before confirming the decision to implement changes.
 - c. The new permit charges will be introduced as permits are renewed or issued from around May 2020.

- d. Annual permit prices will increase by £4 in April 2022 and then every 2 years until 2026.
- e. Other fees and charges (parking suspensions and waivers, APM's) will be introduced from April 2020.
- f. Trials of camera enforcement outside schools and the persistent evader policy will commence in through 2020, with final policies for both developed by April 2021.
- g. Parking reviews being prepared for committee from April 2020 will be limited to proposals that are intended to resolve safety and obstruction problems only if there is no parking surplus or other financial contribution towards the funding.

Contact Officer:

David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, 0300 200 1003

Consulted:

All Surrey district and borough councils

Cabinet Member for Highways

Local Committee chairs group

Communities, Environment and Transport Select Committee

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Explanation of changes and proposals

Annex 2 – Updated Parking Strategy

Annex 3 – Equalities Impact Assessment

Sources/background papers: Parking Strategy Update, Communities, Environment and Transport Select Committee 18 September 2019.

This Annex set out the reasoning for the decisions contained in the main report.

Parking Reviews

- 1 Parking reviews are the way we manage on street parking controls and changing demands for them. The review combines all the agreed changes to parking restrictions in a district or borough over a period of time, (typically 12 to 15 months) so that they can be taken through the statutory process together. This saves time and money. By law it is necessary to place a statutory notice in a local paper to amend or create a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for a parking restriction. If carried out in isolation each notice could cost around £800 depending on the size and the paper. A single advert for multiple sites saves thousands of pounds in advertising costs and overall the cost of implementing a typical parking restriction can be reduced from approximately £1000 to £300 by combining them in a review.
- 2 The Surrey parking team carry out parking reviews in ten of the eleven districts and boroughs on a rolling cycle. Each local or joint committee has a review every 15 months (5 cycles). The reviews typically take between 6 and 12 months to implement depending on their size and complexity. Guildford Borough carry out their own reviews following a similar process but on a different time span related to the competing needs of the urban and rural areas of the borough.
- 3 Members are generally consulted through the whole assessment and implementation process. Meetings and site visits with the parking team when preparing proposals for committee are generally helpful in developing the report and when making the decisions about what to implement. The council's scheme of delegation has been amended to allow the post consultation decisions about what to implement to be made outside of committee which saves time.
- 4 The parking team have developed and fine-tuned the review process using feedback from members and the public so that it is now a well understood process and a feature of the local committee calendar.
- 5 The consultation stage makes the most of information that can be provided via our web pages such as plans and we also encourage comments and feedback to be made directly via our web pages for easier processing. The best way of alerting residents and businesses to proposed changes however is still to letter drop (or mail shot) and put up notices/posters where changes are planned. Councillors and our community partnership teams also often use social media to engage residents about the proposals.
- 6 The implementation stages of the review can sometimes be frustrated by bad weather or parked vehicles. A typical parking review can have up to 50 sites and most of the locations are heavily parked so access for the contractor can be difficult. Lining work is very weather dependant, can't be done in rain or when it's very cold. Some sites also need mechanical sweeping so this is co-ordinated with the boroughs if possible.

- 7 Under our current contract, we only pay for completed work. The arrangement we have with our contractor is that they will make three visits to each site and do as much as they can before we focus more resource to finish off any remaining gaps.
- 8 There are usually one or two locations in every review that are difficult to finish (perhaps where the owner hasn't moved a car for various reasons). In extreme cases we have used a car lifter to move vehicle out the way but this can be expensive and notices still need to be put up in advance.
- 9 If we tried to cone off all the sites in a review in advance we might need 300 cones (a truck load) and the services of a traffic management crew which could cost up to £3000. But there's no guarantee the work would go ahead as planned because of unreliable weather. The risk is similar hiring a tow truck in advance, we can't be certain lining work is possible until a day or two beforehand.
- 10 The system that has been developed allows for the unpredictability of weather and people (and so takes a bit longer) but has the lowest cost.
- 11 However, preparations for the next highway works contract will look at greater traffic management involvement for the contractor as part of the implementation process. We also work closely with the district and borough councils and cooperate to implement new restrictions where possible.
- 12 Parking reviews should typically deal with smaller scale issues and are not intended to be used for introducing anything other than small scale resident or parking management schemes. Larger schemes must be funded separately.
- 13 **Parking Reviews - Proposal**
 - a) The review process has been refined over the last 10 years and there are no significant changes proposed to the process as we believe it is working well.
 - b) The scope of parking reviews should be adjusted to suit the funding available. Where there is no parking surplus or other income to put towards it, the review proposals should only include restrictions that maintain road safety, prevent serious obstruction or essential access to facilities.
 - c) Local and Joint Committees should look to introduce on-street parking charging to help improve access to retail areas.

Permit Parking Schemes

- 14 Permit schemes (aka resident parking schemes or controlled parking zones) are usually introduced near town centres or rail stations to help residents park near their homes. The introduction of permit schemes tends to reduce unrestricted free parking and so can help encourage the use of car parks or other modes of transport.
- 15 The schemes are often controversial, some residents and businesses can be very supportive or opposed depending on their outlook and circumstances. Decision making can be very difficult and time consuming for the council in circumstances where opinion is divided. In 2015 we introduced a policy whereby when residents

request a parking scheme, we want them to demonstrate there is support by submitting a parking scheme petition. We generally require at least 70% of those households who will be directly affected to sign up to the scheme before we will investigate whether to take it forward. This has been successful in reducing requests for residents parking schemes (and the time we spend investigating them) from small groups of residents who do not represent the majority. We do not propose to change this.

- 16 We do however reserve the right to implement parking schemes when there are other transportation initiatives or policies that require some form of parking control and the final decision lies with the traffic authority (SCC).
- 17 Only relatively small permit schemes can be implemented as part of a parking review. Larger schemes tend to be more expensive and resource intensive and take longer so would need dedicated resources and funding.
- 18 Resident permits are currently charged at £50 for the first and £75 for subsequent ones issued to the same household. This is the minimum charge under our policy however local committees can set higher figures. The number of permits allocated per household can also be set by the committee depending on the road space available. In many cases we allow households to have permits for all the vehicles they cannot park off street. This helps cope with larger households where siblings stay at home longer but does impact on single car households who find it more difficult to find a space.
- 19 Visitor permits are currently charged at £2 per day and generally limited to 120 per year per household.

Residential Development in CPZ's

- 20 New developments that increase population density levels within existing permit schemes can often put pressure on street parking availability. It is understandable that larger single properties are demolished to make way for flats and apartments in urban areas but these can increase population density and usually have less off street parking availability per dwelling.
- 21 In some CPZ's there may be road space to accommodate the additional vehicles but in many there will not. As a default position, new residential properties within existing CPZ's should not automatically be permitted on street parking permits. The local committee (as part of a parking review) or Cabinet Member/local planning authority at the planning stage should determine permit eligibility for significant new developments. There may also be an increasing number of 'car free' developments that can be excluded from permit provision in the traffic orders to enforce this planning condition.

Residents Permits - proposal

- 22 Continue to make a charge that covers administration and enforcement costs but also recovers the capital cost of implementing and then maintaining the permit scheme. Allow permit numbers to be set locally to suit circumstances but increase the charge for the second and subsequent permits to reflect the additional road space occupied by a household.

- 23 The cost breakdown for a permit in a typical scheme of say 50 properties would be:
- Setting up permit scheme and maintaining £25 (about 30 minutes officer time per application)
 - Enforcement £45 (approximately 1.5 hours per week CEO time)
 - Repayment of Implementation costs and ongoing maintenance £10 (repayment over 10 years)
- 24 Therefore the total charge for a single permit would equate to £80. If each property purchased one permit the installation, administration, maintenance and enforcement costs would be covered.
- 25 The charge for subsequent permits could be made higher to discourage excessive on street parking (and encourage off street parking) and deter applications for two or more permits (whilst recognising there are larger households but being able to cater for this eventuality)
- 26 The charge for subsequent permits should be:
- 2nd permit £100
 - 3rd and subsequent £130

Visitor permits

- 27 These are currently charged at £2 for a day regardless of location or the period of time needed. Feedback over the last few years indicates that £2 is quite expensive for visitors who only stay for a short period of time in some area. However it is also quite cheap to park all day in a major town centre location. There is also demand for 'childcare' permits. At the moment many households that have regular childcare visitors must purchase one day visitor permits of which only 120 are available per year. These could be issued to a resident who has regular childcare needs.

Business and Local Worker Permits

- 28 The charge for business permits is currently between £150 and £500 depending on the nature of the permit scheme. The permits are intended for operational use (say for delivery vehicles or estate agents vehicles) but can also be used for staff/employee parking within a permit scheme if that is appropriate. There are often small businesses located in residential areas and their parking needs have to be catered for. We do not issue many business permits, income is approximately £80,000 per year.
- 29 There seems little need to change the current arrangements.

Carer and medical permits

- 30 Carer permits are issued to residents who receive regular visits from carers (who could be family, friends or healthcare professionals).

- 31 Medical permits are issued to healthcare professionals or organisations who regularly need to park in controlled parking areas to visit their patients.
- 32 The difference between them is that the carers permit is issued to the resident who needs care who then gives it to their visitors while they are parked nearby, the medical permit is issued to the healthcare company or NHS for their staff to carry with them.
- 33 The current charge is £10 for a carers permits and medical permits are free.
- 34 Some households have regular childcare visitors (not health or welfare related). A permit could be made available on the same basis as a resident permit for this situation instead of using daily visitor permits.

Motorcycle permits

- 35 Residents with motorcycles are currently able to apply for permits for their vehicles at the standard rate (£50). Historically it has been difficult to display a paper permit on a motorcycle so uptake has been low and/or it is easier to store them off road. With the increasing use of virtual permits it is easier for motorcycles to comply with permit scheme rules and permits can be charged at the proposed rate for cars.

Permits – Summary of Proposals

- 36 Introduce changes for residents permits, as described in paragraphs 22-26 above, which aim to recover the cost of implementing, administering, maintaining and enforcing permit schemes in Surrey. The charge for additional permits will be set higher to discourage multiple vehicle households while recognising it is a reality.
- 37 All permit charges will be reviewed roughly in line with inflation from April 2022 and again in 2024 and 2026.
- 38 Visitor permits could be made more flexible by offering:
- a) A 2 hour permit for £1, valid in all locations – with a maximum allocation of 250 per year per property
 - b) An all-day permit in ‘out of town’ locations for £2 – maximum 150 per year
 - c) An all-day permit for ‘larger town’ centres charged at £3 per day – maximum 150 per year
 - d) A child care permit at the same rate as a resident permit dependent on how many had been issued to the property.
 - e) Greater discretion to allow district and borough enforcement teams to issue more/fewer visitor permits as circumstances allow.
- 39 Remove the charge for carer permits and make no change to the charge for medical permits.
- 40 All permits should be ‘virtual’ by the end of 20/21 to improve ease of application.
- 41 The default position will be that new developments in existing permit schemes or CPZ’s should not be eligible for resident permits. This requirement can be amended by a local committee in a parking review or cabinet member.

- 42 Where permissible, developers of new developments should make a contribution towards the cost of managing on street parking arrangements in the local area if there is likely to be an impact on street parking.

Suspensions and Waivers

- 43 The reasons and processes for granting Suspensions and Waiver Certificates are broadly the same. The difference in deciding which to allow will be based on the particular circumstances of the request and the solution provided. For example does a particular bay require suspending to allow access, or will a Waiver Certificate allow a vehicle to park in the general vicinity of work taking place.
- **Suspensions**
A suspension is where the restriction (Traffic Regulation Order or TRO) allowing or disallowing an act to take place is suspended for a set time period.
 - **Waiver Certificates**
A Waiver Certificate is supplied to a vehicle or vehicles' (registration(s)) giving them dispensation to park within an existing TRO restriction.
 - **Restrictions**
A restriction can include: a limited wait free bay, a pay and display bay or a yellow line.
- 44 Generally waivers to be used on double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) should not be provided unless there is no other option and a risk assessment has been carried out. Where for example a restriction is intended simply to deter commuter parking, so only a single yellow line, B&Ds should be in a position to agree a suspension / waiver.

Criteria for Considering a Request

- 45 Either a Suspension or Waiver Certificate can be allowed in special circumstances that may include (but are not limited to):
- a) maintaining public or traffic safety
 - b) essential building or maintenance works
 - c) furniture removals (some dispensations already apply in these circumstances)
 - d) filming
 - e) special events
 - f) weddings or funerals (some dispensations already apply in these circumstances)
- 46 Before granting either it will be necessary to consider whether any such request is genuine, justified, safe and will not have a prohibitively disruptive effect on the local amenity. Granting of either a Suspension or Waiver Certificate is entirely at the Council's discretion.

Suspensions Issuing Procedure

- 47 With a Suspension ideally signs will need to be erected some days in advance. Photographs of vehicles parked when suspension signs are erected will enable appeals officers to decide appeals where drivers say they parked prior to the suspension signs going up.

Waiver Certificate Issuing Procedure

- 48 Ideally for ease and speed of communication these should be issued by pdf document attached to an e-mail. To be printed off and displayed on the dashboard of the vehicle(s) concerned.

Existing Fees (set in 2011)

Table a

	Initial Period	Initial Charge	Subsequent Period	Subsequent Charge
Suspension (each 6m length)	3 days	£65	each additional day	£10
Waiver Certificate (per vehicle)	3 days	£15		£5

Proposed Fees

- 49 These are shown increased broadly in line with inflation since 2011 to maintain recovery of the cost of providing the service.

Table b

	Initial Period	Initial Charge	Subsequent Period	Subsequent Charge
Suspension (each 6m length)	3 days	£75	each additional day	£12
Waiver Certificate (per vehicle)	3 days	£25		£6

- 50 Total income is presently around £200,000 per year which would increase to approximately £240,000.

Exemptions

- 51 Local authorities while carrying out statutory duties on the highway and utility companies while carrying out works on the highway are only subject to the initial charge. Local enforcement team should have discretion whether to apply these charges to charitable organisations as part of community events.

Persistent Evader Vehicle Immobilisation

- 52 Some vehicle owners contravene parking regulations deliberately and often, and fail to settle the debts they incur. A vehicle owner can be classed as a 'persistent evader' if there are three or more recorded contraventions for the vehicle and the penalties for these have not been paid, represented against or appealed against within the statutory time limits, or their representations and appeals have been rejected but they have still not paid. Usually this is because the vehicle keeper is not registered, or is not correctly registered, on the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) database and the owner is confident that they can avoid paying any penalty charges. Where a vehicle appears to be registered in the UK, but the identity and address is not registered, or is not correctly registered on the DVLA database, we can consider making the information available to the police who can, if appropriate, investigate any criminal offence.
- 53 DfT advice is that when parked in contravention, a persistent evader's vehicle should be subject to the strongest possible enforcement following the issue of the penalty charge notice and confirmation of persistent evader status. This is likely to involve immobilisation or removal. The benefit of immobilisation/removal is that it requires proof of ownership and a registered address before release. Currently, under Traffic Management Act 2004 regulations an authority can only obtain payment for the penalty charge notice of the contravention for which the vehicle is immobilised or removed and not any other outstanding penalty charge notices.
- 54 Removing a vehicle to a pound is more complicated and potentially expensive, we do not have an 'in house' pound and it would be expensive to set one up. Clamping is more cost effective, however the ability to release vehicles at all times of the day/night would need to be carefully considered. Clamping would only be sensible if a vehicle was not parked in a hazardous location.

Persistent evader - proposal

- 55 Develop and trial a persistent evader policy that will enable immobilisation or removal of persistent evader vehicles in conjunction with district and borough enforcement teams.

Disabled Bays

- 56 Under the Equality Act 2010 organisations are required to take reasonable steps to help provide access to shops, facilities and housing. Our policy for providing disabled bays requires that the resident has a blue badge, no off street parking and a vehicle registered at their address.
- 57 We receive about 400 applications for disabled bays each year and install about 250. We also remove about 100 per year. The number of new bays has been rising steadily and could increase further as changes to blue badge eligibility are widened to those with non-visible as well as physical impairment.

- 58 Most of the bays installed are only advisory in residential areas so a TRO is not required and we aim to order their installation within four months of a successful application. If a TRO is needed (because the bay is located in a CPZ or amongst other restrictions) then for efficiency we do it as part of the next parking review. We batch up work orders for signing and lining work to keep costs at a minimum which is why there can be a wait for the bay to be installed.
- 59 The cost of assessing a disabled bay application is made up of officer time and road marking/signing costs. The cost of installing a disabled bay including this is £200 for an advisory bay or £400 if a sign/TRO is needed as well.
- 60 Our application process allows residents to download a form from our website and send it in with copies of the relevant documents.
- 61 We provide this service for no charge to the applicant and spend about £60,000 annually. Some authorities make a small charge for this service but it does not fully recover the cost of providing a disabled bay and would increase the complexity of administering the process.

Disabled bays – Proposal

- 62 We should improve our on line application process and allow scanned documents to be uploaded via the website rather than being sent in the post.
- 63 Our current criteria for a disabled bay (a blue badge, no off street parking and a vehicle) seems reasonable. A few other councils request evidence of disability benefits (which are not means tested) but this seems overcomplicated.
- 64 Disabled bays should continue to be provided for free but where a TRO is required installed as part of a parking review if this is appropriate.

Access Protection Markings

- 65 Access Protections Markings (APMs) are advisory markings used to highlight the presence of private driveways and smaller side roads. Our policy is to only implement them if a driveway is not clearly visible or obvious and we often ask for evidence that there is an obstruction problem. Never the less we process about 500 applications and mark out about 100 of these lines each year and do not charge for the service.
- 66 The cost of assessment and marking out an APM is approximately £50 in officer time and £100 in contractor costs, including travelling time and setting up on arrival. There may also be parked cars in the way requiring a further visit to finish.

Options for APMs

- 67 APMs are an advisory service and if we are to continue providing them we should make a charge as most other councils now do. The other option is to stop doing them all together but we would still need to deal with enquiries and demand for them. It does not seem necessary to have an overly onerous set of requirements for the introduction

of an APM which again would mean more administration time on applications.

APMs – Proposal

- 68 A charge of £50 should be made to assess a request for an APM and a further £120 (assuming a successful application) to provide a new APM, to refresh an existing APM or to refresh and extend an existing APM up to 6m long. The criteria should include a properly constructed dropped kerb serving a useable driveway and there must be evidence of street parking nearby. An additional £40 will be charged for double width crossovers between 6 and 12m long or for each additional crossover at the same premises.

Footway and Verge Parking

- 69 Within Greater London there is a blanket prohibition of footway and verge parking. Outside of London, footway and verge parking are not specifically prohibited.
- 70 Since 1974, Highway Code rule 244 has stated that drivers "MUST NOT park partially or wholly on the pavement in London and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it.". The key things to note here are the words *must not* and *should not*.
- 71 In London, you *must not* park on the pavement, the *must* indicating there is legislation behind this rule and you could receive a fine for breaking it.
- 72 However, outside of the capital or "elsewhere", the Highway Code states drivers *should not* park on the pavement, meaning it is advisory and not, therefore, backed up by any legislation.
- 73 Rule 242 is where it gets a little less clear, stating: "You MUST NOT leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road."
- 74 This is a *must not*, again, meaning if your car is reported or seen by a police officer and judged to be either in a dangerous position or causing an unnecessary obstruction of the road, you could receive a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN).
- 75 Local/Joint committees have powers to introduce verge or footway parking bans over small or large areas with the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). 'Footway parking' can also be formalised in a similar way but it is likely that engineering measures will be needed to lower kerbs and strengthen the footway where this is done. Utility apparatus may also need to be moved which could be prohibitively expensive. Our existing parking strategy does not allow the formal introduction of footway parking.
- 76 The main drawback to introducing verge or footway parking bans is the cost of installing the required boundary and repeater signs and there is the additional issue of the clutter that they cause, and the main drawback to formalising parking on what was previously footway is the cost of strengthening the area and potentially lowering the

kerb.

- 77 On a national level 'London style' no parking legislation could be introduced by parliament across the rest of the UK. This could have major implications in some streets because footway parking has become accepted practice due to the number of vehicles and the limited width of many roads. We would prefer to have powers to enforce footway obstruction without a TRO in a similar way to the police but following decriminalised parking procedures in a similar way to other parking restrictions.

Footway and Verge Parking – Proposal

- 78 Local and Joint committees can formalise 'footway parking' where it is safe and there is enough space for pedestrians, subject to making a TRO and adjusting the kerbs and footway strengthening as necessary.
- 79 Local and Joint Committees can implement verge and footway parking bans with a TRO.
- 80 The Council should continue to oppose footway and verge parking elsewhere and introduce restrictions to allow enforcement where appropriate.
- 81 We should also support changes to national legislation to decriminalise the offence of footway obstruction so that it can be enforced by Civil Enforcement Officers without a TRO.

On Street Parking Charges

- 82 There are currently on street parking charges in limited waiting bays in Guildford, Woking, Farnham and West Byfleet town centres. There are also some longer term paid for bays around Walton on Thames Station used primarily by rail commuters.
- 83 On street charges are beneficial in terms of creating turnover or churn and help improve enforcement efficiency. Surplus income can also be used to improve the local highways and public realm infrastructure.
- 84 Most limited waiting bays in Surrey are free and have time limits ranging from 30 minutes to 3 hours. Conversely most District and Borough Councils charge for parking in their car parks, so parking in premium locations (eg right outside shops) is free, whereas there is a fee for parking further away in a car park. Not only is this counter-intuitive but it can also lead to people driving around trying to find a free on street space. Some D&B's in the county still operate parking enforcement at a loss so additional income from parking charges would improve the financial situation. The enforcement of limited waiting bays can be time consuming and there are often complaints that visitors and local workers overstay the time limits when there is not an enforcement officer in the area, to the frustration of some businesses.
- 85 The decision as to whether charges should be introduced currently lies with local and joint committees.

Parking charges – Proposal

- 86 The council should support the introduction of on street parking charges (including the provision of free periods where it is financially viable and the best solution) to increase enforcement efficiency, churn and access to facilities.
- 87 The parking team should work with Local and Joint Committees to select trial locations where 'pay and display' would be beneficial, as part of the parking review process.

Red Routes

- 88 Where urban roads are heavily trafficked and there is a need to control parking to maintain the free flow of vehicles, it is normally sufficient to prohibit waiting and loading at specific times of day. However, this does not prevent vehicles stopping for the purpose of picking up and setting down passengers, which in itself can contribute to traffic congestion on very busy roads.
- 89 An alternative type of control to “no waiting” and “no loading” is the red route, which prohibits stopping. First introduced in London, red routes are now prescribed by the Department for Transport (DfT). Unlike a red route clearway, a red route has road markings and is more flexible as it does not need to operate for the whole day. Also, provision can be made for parking and loading at certain times.
- 90 DfT advice is that red routes are intended to be used strategically to deal with traffic problems assessed on a whole-route basis, not to deal with issues on relatively short lengths of road. As with a red route clearway, the prohibition of stopping extends to the verge and footway. A red route order should permit a licensed taxi to stop to pick up or set down passengers and the driver of a vehicle displaying a blue badge to stop to pick up or set down a disabled person. Drivers of other vehicles should not be permitted to stop for any purpose other than in an emergency.
- 91 As the name “red route” implies, the road markings are red, which means that a red route has to be introduced in isolation and cannot be combined with the more conventional yellow line restriction. It is not possible to introduce a peak-hour prohibition of stopping with waiting restrictions at other times; red and yellow lines cannot both be laid along the same length of road. Therefore red route controls either operate for 24 hours or, if overnight parking can be permitted, throughout the day, typically 7 am to 7 pm.
- 92 Provision will need to be made for loading where this is essential for businesses along the route and cannot be accommodated either off-highway or on adjacent roads. A red route can therefore include loading bays which operate either for the full duration of red route control or for some shorter period. Loading bays might not be required where the red route operates during daytime hours only and loading can take place overnight. Provision may be made for on-street parking, particularly for disabled badge holders, where there is no alternative (i.e. off-highway or on adjacent roads). Time-limited waiting by any vehicle might be required where small retail businesses, for example, could be adversely affected by red route controls. Parking and loading bays should normally be the exception rather than the rule and should be provided only over short lengths of road. To do otherwise could

undermine the concept of the red route, which is intended to provide a road free of stationary vehicles. However, where controls that operate throughout the day (e.g. 7 am to 7 pm) are primarily intended to prevent stopping during peak hours, it will not be necessary to restrict the provision of loading and parking bays if these are required only during off-peak periods. A bay may have dual use, e.g. used both by disabled badge holders and for loading.

Red Routes – Proposal

- 93 Red routes can be considered by Local/Joint Committees as part of the parking review process but their use should be limited to the primary route network (A Road or SPN 1) and used consistently along a clearly defined route where they would help maintain traffic flow.
- 94 The cost of implementing a red route could be high over a continuous length of road and camera enforcement is likely to be necessary. Implementation and enforcement costs should be identified in advance.

<h3>Camera Enforcement of Parking Restrictions</h3>
--

- 95 The enforcement of parking restrictions solely by camera is now only allowed for contraventions on School Keep Clears (SKC's), bus stop clearways/bus lanes and red routes. In this context this is where a parking contravention is identified by a camera operator (who would be a trained CEO) who then issues a PCN to the vehicle keeper through the post based on video evidence.
- 96 Vehicles equipped with Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) can also be used to gather information about parking contraventions but a CEO must place a PCN on the vehicle at the time of the offence in the conventional manner rather than the owner receiving it through the post.
- 97 As discussed above, if red routes were implemented in Surrey they could (and would need to) be enforced by camera to improve compliance.
- 98 Another application for camera enforcement is outside schools. In most districts and boroughs there are not enough CEOs to provide a presence outside most schools each day. Borough enforcement teams prioritise the neediest locations and rotate staff appropriately. Parking and driving behaviour usually improves when there is a CEO present but they cannot spread themselves thinly enough around all the schools each day. Cameras may help this situation.
- 99 Two main types of camera application are possible:
 - a) Static (fixed to lamp columns although they can be moved fairly easily). Advantages are that these are usually left in place for weeks or months and can have a longer term effect on behaviour. As camera hardware becomes cheaper, more can be purchased and rotated around schools as needed.

- b) Mobile (usually on a CCTV camera car). The vehicle can be purchased outright (higher upfront costs) or leased for periods of time as needed.
- 100 Both methods would require publicity and awareness campaigns with school users and parents to increase effectiveness. Our Road Safety and Active Travel Team would be involved with this work as well as selecting potential sites.
- 101 There are around 10 schools in each borough that might need regular camera enforcement, so that would equate to at least 110 around the whole county. Managing this operation could become quite onerous and expensive. The income from PCN's issued on SKC's would offset the cost however the operation might not be self-financing as compliance levels would be likely to increase significantly.

Camera Enforcement - Proposal

- 102 The council should approve the use of enforcement cameras where they are permitted to be used on the highway and set up trials with enforcement partners to determine the most effective means of enforcement (both in terms of compliance and cost) to help shape a longer term camera enforcement policy for SKC's.