

**NEWCASTLE UNDER LYME COUNCIL JOINT PARKING COMMITTEE**

**22 OCTOBER 2012**

---

**CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT (CPE) –  
RESIDENTS PARKING ZONE – THE VILLAGE, KEELE**

**Recommendations of Staffordshire County Council Cabinet Member (Highways and Transport)**

1. Note the contents of this report.
2. No further action is taken to introduce a fully comprehensive permit parking scheme along The Village at Keele.
3. Members consider prioritising under the current process the future consideration of a simplified permit parking scheme for those residents of The Village currently without off-street parking availability.
4. The Keele University is thanked for considering making a financial contribution to implementing such a scheme.
5. The Parish Council is requested to consider offering parking spaces at the Village Hall to those residents that do not have off-street parking provision.

**Report of the Deputy Chief Executive and Director for Place**

**PART A**

**Why is it coming here – what decisions are required**

6. To update members of the initial investigation into the development of a permit only parking scheme in The Village at Keele and to determine whether or not further investigation and development is required.

**Reasons for Recommendations**

7. To advise Members of the results of the preliminary investigation into the provision of a residents permit parking scheme at the Village in Keele and to determine an appropriate course of action.

**PART B**

**Background**

8. It has been alleged that the parking taking place along The Village at Keele prevents local residents from parking their vehicles close to their property. It is believed that this level of parking is caused, primarily, by students accessing Keele University. The majority of properties along The Village have off-street parking with many having sufficient space to accommodate not only residents' own vehicles but also a number of visitors'. However there are a number of properties with no off-street parking facilities. To help residents to park close to their property Keele Parish Council has requested that a residents permit parking scheme be introduced. The introduction of such schemes

is decided in accordance with approved policies by the relevant Joint Parking Committee and is subject to the County Council and national procedures governing the introduction of the necessary Traffic Order. The funding for such schemes usually has to be met by the residents themselves although funding from elsewhere may be possible. In this instance it would appear that Keele University may be prepared to make some financial contribution.

9. Members may recall from their meeting back in April 2011 that following earlier discussions with a Borough Council Member the member was given a number of Permit Parking Information Packs for distribution to residents of The Village. The packs contained an Application Form for residents to submit thereby registering their formal interest in the introduction of a permit parking scheme. Only two such forms were submitted.
10. More recently the Parish Council has again raised the issue of permit parking along The Village advising that the University may still be prepared to make a financial contribution to the introduction of such a scheme. It was therefore agreed that a simple feasibility study be undertaken to help ascertain residents' views and their actual parking needs.
11. Consultation was undertaken earlier this year with a request for views to be submitted by 23 May 2012. In practice any comments received up to the preparation of this report have been taken into consideration. A summary of the responses is detailed later in this report.
12. The current approved Policy would normally require a 60% return with 85% of those supportive. With only a 42% return rate no further action should be taken. However, if Members wish, it may be possible to solely consider those properties without off-street parking provision. I have to advise that such action is outside of the current policy and may well result in formal objections being received during the public advertisement stage of the advertising procedure.
13. Whilst there is a possibility of funding from the University, residents were still asked whether or not they would be prepared to meet any charges associated with the scheme. This was felt necessary to help ascertain the level of inconvenience being caused i.e. if the inconvenience is sufficient to justify personal expenditure to resolve. Even if the University is prepared to meet some or all of the initial costs depending on the detail of the scheme introduced there might still be an on-going annual permit fee that will need addressing.
14. It should also be remembered that the Parish Council has expressed concern about the parking situation elsewhere in the village. Members will recall a high priority being given to attempting to resolve parking issues along Quarry Bank Road. Displaced traffic from any permit scheme introduced along the Village may impact elsewhere in Keele and is, as always, a consideration.
15. If permit parking was to be introduced thereby encouraging parking on one side of the road it would be necessary to formally prohibit parking on the opposite side so as to ensure the free flow of traffic.
16. An estimate of the costs involved to introduce an all encompassing scheme along the whole of The Village includes £1500 formal advertising and £2000 signs and lines. Additional costs may be incurred if traffic management is required to enable signing works to be undertaken. The annual permit charge elsewhere has been determined at around £50. However this may need to be increased given the level of enhanced enforcement that may be required to ensure a successful scheme. Whether or not there would be an on-going commitment from the University to meet this annual permit charge together with future maintenance costs is currently unknown. The costs of the current consultation have been met by existing SCC budgets. The staff costs of processing a scheme could be in the region of £8000. With no real traffic management benefits in terms of road safety, improvement in traffic flow or control of parking the whole of these costs should be recoverable via the scheme.

## **Consultation Responses**

17. 26 Consultation letters sent out to all residents of The Village. (23 April 2012 responses requested by 23 May 2012)
18. 11 responses have been received (42%)
19. Of those responses 6 (55%) support a scheme without a cost to the residents, 4 (36%) support a scheme and are prepared to pay costs with 1 (9%) reserving judgement until the actual cost is known.
20. Of the 11 responses 4 were received from residents who have no off-street parking with three of those wishing to apply for permits. Only one of those wishing to apply for permits supported the introduction of charges.
21. Of the remaining 7 responses 2 did not wish to apply for permits. Based on the questionnaire responses the final 5 could accommodate all their current vehicle ownership within the boundary of their property. 3 could also accommodate not only their existing vehicle ownership but also additional vehicles for which permits are requested.

## **Conclusions**

22. I would respectfully suggest that as only one of the residents without off-street parking provision considers the issue sufficient to be prepared or is able to pay associated costs the inconvenience caused may not solely concern the need to park close to ones property. It is possible, given experience elsewhere that some residents may wish to see the road outside of their home free of parked cars irrespective of their personal parking requirements. This view might be reinforced by the number of permit requests from those residents who have sufficient off-street parking space for their own vehicles and also for those for which they have requested permits. However, it is accepted that in some circumstances parking on the road can still be desirable, though not a right, in preference to using ones own driveway.
23. It can be seen from the consultation that only 4 residents without off-street parking have responded with 3 likely to require permits. Of those 3 residents only 1 supported the introduction of charges. Two vehicles are owned between those 3 properties with a further 2 vehicles visiting regularly. A total of 6 permits have been requested from these 3 properties (4 Standard and 2 visitor). This level of parking could be accommodated within the subject length of road whilst leaving some unrestricted parking. Thereby increasing the possibility of a simplified permit scheme being considered. However, such a scheme might worsen the situation for other residents and would not make provision for carers and general visitors, as this would increase the amount of road space generally unavailable for parking by others, including residents, nor would it be able to make concessions for the more vulnerable residents as would be the case in larger zonal restrictions. However Members may consider the implementation of such a scheme worthy of consideration.
24. I see little advantage on road safety, congestion or general traffic management grounds to provide dedicated on-street parking for those residents who have the benefit of off-street parking. Such action is likely to result in displacing vehicles to less acceptable locations within the area.
25. There is likely to be an understandable desire from those without off-street parking to be able to park close to their home. However, whether or not there is external funding available there is a resource implication in making such provision that will impact on the development of other schemes. In addition, the introduction of a permit scheme to benefit only 3 residents, (other responders having off-street provision) is not the intention of the current Policy whereby larger zones are more likely to prove of greater benefit for residents. Whilst the Policy does provide for a permit scheme to be

introduced on single streets such action should really be reserved for those areas with little, if any, existing off-street provision.

- 26 Members may recall previously resisting calls for preliminary investigations to be carried out into areas of the Borough beyond that currently being investigated. The difficulties being experienced in developing the current scheme, which could impact on over 250 properties across some 12 streets of mixed retail/business and residential use has delayed the commencement of other schemes. The Dunkirk area of the Borough is currently prioritised as the next for consideration which is likely to consider the parking needs of residents possibly over some 10 streets comprising in excess of 300 properties. These numbers obviously depend on the actual extent of zone(s) considered appropriate. Given the numbers of residents affected in these two areas alone, whilst appreciating the difficulties being experienced along The Village, there appears little justification to recommend devoting any more resource trying to promote a scheme that may benefit only a handful of residents at most, and who appear to be inconvenienced only during University term times.
- 27 It is noted and welcomed that the University may be prepared to offer some financial assistance in resolving the issues. It is understood that some agreement may already exist for certain residents to park within the University grounds and if so it is respectfully suggested that this is a more practicable solution to the difficulties being experienced.
- 28 An alternative solution might be for those residents without off-street parking to be allowed spaces on the Village Hall car park when events permit.
- 29 If Members considered that the current parking situation warranted action to improve road safety, traffic flow or the amenity of the area, possibly to the detriment of other areas, then action by way of a Traffic Regulation Order to remove some or all of this parking could be prioritised by Members in the usual manner. At that time further consideration could be given to a simplified permit scheme.

### **Summary**

- 30 A total of 26 were letters sent out, 11 responses received. (4 of which have no off-street parking). Only 3 of those without off-street parking would be interested in receiving a parking permit. There appears little justification for further action.

### **Future Proposals**

- 31 Consideration of this particular scheme has been undertaken at Members request although other schemes have previously received a higher priority. The current first area of priority (South east area of Newcastle under Lyme Town Centre), although difficult, is still on-going and should therefore remain a priority. Whilst the next area for consideration has been identified as that around Dunkirk, again close to Newcastle Town Centre, Members will be asked to confirm their priority upon completion of current priority scheme.

## Appendix 1: Community Impact Assessment

Name of Policy/Project/Proposal: CPE Residents Parking Zone – The Village, Keele		
Responsible officer: Kevin Smith		
Commencement date & expected duration: On-going		
	Impact Assessment	
	+ve/ neutral/ -ve	Degree of impact and signpost to where implications reflected
Outcomes plus		
Prosperity, knowledge, skills, aspirations	+ve	Transport, parking and highway operations support the planned economy; with parking enforcement improving traffic flows supporting businesses and communities; Improved public realm.
Living safely	+ve	Road safety: reductions in road casualties and antisocial use of vehicles.
Supporting vulnerable people	+ve	Poorly and inconsiderately parked vehicles can often obstruct pavements badly affecting the passage of wheelchair users.
Supporting healthier living	+ve	Sustainable transport/accessibility options; enhanced public realm.
Highways and transport networks	Neutral	
Learning, education and culture	Neutral	
Children and young people	+ve	Road safety: reductions in road casualties and antisocial use of vehicles.
Citizens & decision making/improved community involvement	Neutral	
Physical environment including climate change	Neutral	
Maximisation of use of community property portfolio	Neutral	
Equalities impact: This report has been prepared in accordance with the County Council's policies on Equal Opportunities and in fact CPE strongly supports social inclusion as the needs of those with disabilities, vulnerable adults and children, as well as economic regeneration are specifically met by a well-managed system of car parking provision and controls.		
Age	+ve	Improved transportation for those too young to drive: Walking, cycling and public transport delivery.
Disability	+ve	Provision of integrated transport infrastructure compliant with DDA requirements.
Ethnicity	Neutral	
Gender	Neutral	
Religion/Belief	Neutral	
Sexuality	Neutral	
<b>Impact/implications</b>		

<p><b>Resource and Value for money</b> In consultation with finance representative</p>	<p>The initial investigations associated with the development of the RPZ requests is provided as part of the County Councils highway responsibilities however, the development of detailed schemes and implementation has to be funded from either the CPE Appropriation Account for the District, after providing for a reasonable reserve of 10% of the gross annual operating cost in the CPE account, or some other source if the account is not in surplus. The CPE Appropriation Account is built up from surpluses that arise after contributing to the eligible start up costs (including first year deficits) paid for directly by the District and County Council in the relevant District Council Area. If the relevant District is in deficit, the set up costs will have to be met from another source of funding. It will be necessary to seek agreement to meeting any such costs, as well as the annual permit fee, before a scheme can be fully implemented.</p>
<p><b>Risks identified and mitigation offered</b></p>	<p>There are no risks associated with this report at this stage.</p>
<p><b>Legal imperative to change</b> In consultation with legal representative</p>	<p>The making of a formal permit parking scheme requires a TRO and this is a formal legal process covered by the County Councils scheme of delegations and constrained by legislation, set procedures and consultation process.</p>

**Health Impact Assessment Screening**

In summary no significant negative impacts on public health have been identified in respect to the outcomes of this report.

**Background Documents**

SCC Policy and Guidelines for Residents Parking  
Previous reports to NBC Joint Parking Committee