

**Newcastle Under Lyme Borough Council Joint Parking Committee  
22 July 2013**

**CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT (CPE) –  
Proposed Residents Parking Zone – South East of Town Centre.**

**Recommendations of Staffordshire County Council Cabinet Member (Communities & Localism):**

1. Note the contents of this report.
2. Approve the implementation of the proposed Residents Parking Scheme as previously discussed and approve the proposed amendments to the proposed Visitor Permits as discussed in paragraph 10(f).
3. Residents are advised of the deliberations of this committee and the implications of the decision taken.
4. Confirm the Dunkirk area of the Borough as the next to be considered for the introduction of a Residents Permit Parking Scheme.

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

**PART A**

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

5. To update Members of the current position regarding the introduction of a proposed scheme following the invitation to residents to apply for permits and to determine whether or not to proceed with the introduction of the scheme.

**Reasons for Recommendations**

6. Following the invitation to residents to apply for Permits further opposition to the scheme has been received by way of petitions. Confirmation of Members continued support or approval of an alternative proposal is therefore sought.

**PART B**

**Background:**

7. Members will recall the approval to introduce a new Residential Parking Zone to the South East of the Town Centre. The need to extend the current scheme, charge for Permits, levy a one off Joining Fee and prioritise the type and issue of Permits has previously been considered and approved by this Committee. The required Traffic Regulation Order has been advertised. Objections and representations concerning the scheme received during the advertisement of the Traffic Order and prior consultations undertaken with residents have been considered by this Committee and the County Council. As a result approval was given to implement the scheme and residents invited to apply for Permits.

8. All residents within the review area have been advised of the details of the approved scheme including the type and number of permits available and have been invited to apply for permits. A copy of the letter is attached (appendix A) to this report for Members information. Members are reminded that the annual cost of a Standard Permit was set at £45, with concessions, with an additional one off Joining fee set at £50. This latter fee is a contribution to the set up and future maintenance of the scheme and has been subsidised by a contribution, on Traffic Management grounds, from the local County Councillors Divisional Highways Programme.
9. In response to the invitation to apply for permits petitions have been received opposing the scheme from residents of Hanover Street and from Vessey Terrace. The petition from Vessey Terrace has been re-submitted on two further occasions with some additional signatures and comments. Copies of the petitions together with an officer response are attached (Appendix B) for Members information. (The earlier consultation letters have not been included due to the cost and resource implications although they were attached to the responses to the petitioners). A number of issues are raised the majority of which have been considered previously.
10. The main issues raised along with the Officer response are detailed below. Copies of the letters are also attached under Appendix B:

(a) The petitioners dispute the amount of consultation.

**Officer response:** The attached (Appendix C) shows the dates of the letters forwarded, together with the circulation list, and the JPC's at which the proposals were discussed.

(b) The petitioners dispute the need to change the existing arrangements.

**Officer response:** Understandable. A free service has been enjoyed for many years. However, it is considered no longer sustainable to expect council tax payers from elsewhere in the Borough to effectively fund free Permits for some. The current proposals seek to ensure that the existing signs/lines and Traffic Order is up to date and that the basis of the scheme complies with any future scheme introduced elsewhere in the Borough. It is also considered that a 'two tier' system whereby residents in one street are expected to pay for the service whilst others enjoy the same service for free.

(c) The petitioners dispute the level of charges and the costs involved seeking insurances about future increases.

**Officer response:** The charges (£45 per annual Permit (Standard) and a one off 'joining fee' of £50, with concessions) have been approved previously. District and Borough Councils consider the level of charge for permits to be acceptable and covers the administration of the scheme. The Joining Fee is a contribution to the set up costs and future maintenance of the scheme. The Petitioners have suggested an alternative costing structure but the current proposals are still considered appropriate (The first year charge for a Standard Permit together with the Joining Fee equates to 26 pence per day).

- (d) The petitioners recommend reducing the width of the footway on the school side of Bankside to accommodate echelon parking thereby increasing the number of parking spaces available.

**Officer response:** The increase in parking spaces would be welcomed. However, such a scheme would be costly and is likely to be detrimental to road safety, especially in relation to the reduced footway width outside of the school. This matter will however be included in future County Council Divisional Highway Programme discussions with the local County Council Member.

- (e) The petitioners dispute the level of responses received.

**Officer response:** The level of responses to the original consultation was reported to Members when determining whether or not to proceed to the detail development of this scheme. Breakdown attached (Appendix D).

- (f) The petitioners (and others) question the appropriateness of the proposed time limitation of Visitor permits.

**Officer response:** Concern expressed by the petitioners and other residents as to the appropriateness of the proposed 4 hour time limited visitor permits is appreciated. There appears to be a number of residents for whom such permits would not be too helpful. Whilst there is a need to control the amount of visitor parking to ensure, as far as is practicable, that such parking does not have too much of a detrimental effect on residents ability to park close to their home. Following discussions between officers of both the County and Borough Councils it is however suggested that the proposal be amended so as to offer 12 hour time restricted permits instead of the originally agreed 4 hour permits. The number of permits being limited to 20 per annum to each household. This is considered to be a more practicable approach than agreed earlier.

- (g) The petitioners want a guarantee to be able to park within 30 metres of their home.

**Officer response:** A guarantee to be able to park within 30 metres of home is not practicable. The intention is not to oversubscribe on the issue of those Permits with a high likelihood of a vehicle being parked for the majority of the time. As residents will obviously prefer to park close to their home it is expected that spaces close to home will be available. However, as the scheme settles down and parking practices become known it is possible that additional permits will be made available.

11. It has taken a considerable amount of officer and Member time to develop the scheme to this point. As such it can be expected that at this stage so long as the number of residents wishing to purchase Permits is financially viable and there is sufficient parking space to accommodate the number of Permits requested the scheme would be implemented. In such circumstances some residents could, understandably, consider that they are being forced to join a scheme. Although it should be noted that there are areas of restricted and unrestricted parking available nearby.
12. To date residents from 72 properties have applied for permits with a total of 97 permits requested. There is sufficient parking space to accommodate 197 vehicles. For the scheme to be financially viable with regards to the expected contribution towards the set up costs residents from 85 properties would have been expected to join the

scheme. If the scheme were to be implemented it is anticipated that this number would be achieved with a likelihood of sufficient spaces being available to cover initial Permit requests.

13. Given the contents of the petitions this report seeks Members views as to the most appropriate way forward. Certain options and their effects are discussed in the attached Appendix E. As discussed at previous meetings it is apparent that the existing free scheme is no longer sustainable and that a 'two tier' scheme with some free permits and some paid for is not preferred. With this in mind the only viable options appear to be either to implement the proposed scheme or discontinue the proposed scheme and withdraw the current arrangements. The effects of these options are explained in Appendix E.
14. Following the receipt of the petitions and requests for permits and prior to the submission of this report discussion had taken place between officers of the County Council and Borough Council, the local County Councillor, local Borough Ward Members and the Chairman Elect of this Committee with a view to determining an appropriate way forward. The elected members considered the options available and all decided to support the implementation of the proposed scheme. That decision is therefore recommended for Members approval.
15. Assuming that the recommendation to implement the proposed scheme is supported it is anticipated that the scheme will be introduced during September 2013. If Members decide not to implement the scheme and withdraw the current arrangements a new Traffic Regulation Order will need to be made with due process. It is anticipated that this would be processed as part of the consideration of this RPZ scheme and would therefore be processed accordingly.

### **Future Proposals**

16. Members are reminded that the Dunkirk area to the west of the town centre has previously been approved as the next area to be considered for a Residents Permit Parking Zone. Members are therefore asked to confirm that this is still so. Consideration would commence with a preliminary consultation with residents to ascertain the level of support. This consultation would commence either after the introduction of the current proposed scheme or after advising residents of the alternative recommendation of this Committee.

### **Summary**

17. A summary of the main issues is as follows:
  - (a) The current proposals seeks to replace the existing 'free Permit' scheme with a paid for scheme and extend it so as to include other roads where residents are experiencing difficulties in parking close to their home.
  - (b) With the support of the JPC due process has been followed including consultation with residents and the advertisement of the required Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).
  - (c) Representations received in response to the consultations and advertisement of the TRO has been considered by the County Council (as the delivery of the TRO is a County responsibility) and the JPC.
  - (d) A pricing and Permit structure has been agreed with the JPC.

- (e) Following an invitation to residents to apply for permits considerable objection has been raised, albeit primarily from those areas where the 'free Permit' scheme is to be replaced by a 'paid for' scheme.
- (f) It is not considered appropriate for a two tier system of scheme (some free with some paid for) to be implemented neither is the current free scheme considered sustainable.
- (g) The proposed level of charges does not seek to make a profit for either authority and are considered to be appropriate. Future Permit charges cannot be guaranteed but changes are subject to JPC approval.
- (h) The preferred option is to introduce the proposed scheme in its entirety although this could be considered as forcing residents to join. However it is expected that permit holders will be able to park close to their home.
- (i) A viable alternative option, given paragraph 17(f) above, is considered to be the abandonment of the current proposals and the removal of the current free scheme. This will result in the unrestricted parking of vehicles in those areas currently enjoying the benefits of the free permit scheme which may assist those parking in adjacent streets, remove some of the school traffic congestion in Bankside, attract traffic from the town centre and increase congestion in those streets currently protected.
- (j) Any further delay in implementing the current proposals may well require the making of a new TRO for any future scheme.
- (k) Removal of the current scheme will require the making of a new TRO.
- (l) If implemented the anticipated 'go-live' date would be early September 2013, consideration of the Dunkirk area of the town would then follow.
- (m) If the proposed scheme was to be abandoned and the existing scheme removed the required TRO would be processed at the same time as consideration of the Dunkirk area commenced.

## Appendix 1:Community Impact Assessment

Name of Policy/Project/Proposal: CPE Residents Parking Zone – Newcastle Under Lyme – South East of Town Centre		
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	
<p>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.</p>		
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 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. 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. Alternatively, the set up costs will have to be met from another source of funding, potentially a 'joining fee' levied on permit holders and it will be necessary to seek their agreement to meeting any such fee, as well as the annual permit fee, before the scheme can be fully implemented.</p>	
<p><b>Risks identified and mitigation offered</b></p>	<p>The current level of support from residents would result in a deficit of £650 in meeting expected set up costs. This deficit would need to be met from the CPE Account if alternative funding could not be identified. However, If the scheme were to be implemented there is an expectation that sufficient additional residents will join the scheme to cover the set up costs in full.</p>	
<p><b>Legal imperative to</b></p>	<p>The making of a formal permit parking scheme and/or certain</p>	

<b>change</b> In consultation with legal representative	other restrictions on traffic 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.
--	---

### **Health Impact Assessment screening:**

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

Author's Name: County Council Officer: Kevin Smith  
Ext. No.: 01785 276727  
Room No.: Regulation and Governance, SP1, Third Floor

### **Background Documents:**

- (i) SCC Policy and Guidelines for Residents Parking
- (ii) Previous reports to NBC Joint Parking Committee
- (iii) Consultation documents.