

Title of meeting:	Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation Decision Meeting
Date of meeting:	23rd September 2015
Subject:	Proposed removal of 3 parking zones (AA Newbolt Road, AC Farmlea Road, JD Portsea North)
Report by:	Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support
Wards affected:	Charles Dickens and Paulsgrove
Key decision:	No
Full Council decision:	No

1. Purpose of report

To consider the responses to the public consultation on the proposals under TROs 55/2015, 56/2015 and 57/2015 relating to the removal of 3 parking zones. When objections are received to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders, it is a statutory requirement to consider them at a formal decision meeting.

Pages 5-9: summary of the public consultation responses
Appendix A: The public notices detailing the proposals

2. Recommendations

2.1 AA Newbolt Road parking zone remains in place.

2.2 AC Farmlea Road parking zone is removed.

2.3 JD Portsea North parking zone remains in place.

3. Background

3.1 At the Traffic & Transportation decision meeting in July 2015, a decision was taken to formally consult on removing AA, AC and JD residents' parking zones.

3.2 This report details the responses to the formal public consultation through the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process.

4. Reasons for recommendations

4.1 The comments received in response to the formal TRO consultation on the proposals have been taken into consideration and the recommendations are primarily based on these responses.

4.2.1 AA Newbolt Road

The number of responses to the formal TRO consultation are as follows:

- Petition of 10 names from the affected properties in objection to the TRO to remove the scheme
- 2 further letters objecting to the TRO to remove the scheme

10 residents of 9 properties affected have responded to the formal TRO public consultation via a petition to request the parking zone stays in place. 2 of those residents also wrote in separately to express individual views on why the zone is needed.

No correspondence in support of the TRO to remove the AA Newbolt Road residents parking scheme was received through the formal TRO public consultation.

The correspondence received in objection to the TRO as detailed above has led to the recommendation not to remove it the AA Newbolt Road residents parking scheme.

4.3.1 AC Farmlea Road

The number of responses to the formal TRO consultation are as follows:

- 3 responses were received in objection to the TRO to remove the zone
- 3 responses were received in support of the TRO to remove the zone

The formal TRO public consultation received 6 responses: 3 responses in favour of keeping the parking zone and 3 responses in favour of removing the parking zone.

Because there is no clear majority in the TRO responses, the previous survey results from the £30 permit charge survey have been taken into account, as has professional judgment regarding the zone.

The £30 permit charge survey results indicated two thirds of residents who responded would prefer the parking zone to be removed.

4.3.2 The zone was originally implemented following residents' concerns over parking by employees based in nearby Port Solent, and that many residents were not using their garages to park their vehicles in. Parking by employees is largely a daytime issue, and in the evenings residents have reported little difference to the available parking space as the vehicles parking are those used by residents

themselves. The zone has 91 on-street parking spaces, 156 valid Resident permits and the majority of properties have access to a garage or hard-standing. Having had experience of controlled parking, paying £30 for a permit with the current level of parking available is not supported by the majority of residents.

The response to the TRO consultation, the original survey on the £30 permit charge, and professional judgement combine to recommend removal.

4.4.1 JD Portsea North

The responses to the formal TRO consultation are as follows:

- 5 responses were received in objection to the TRO to remove the parking zone

4.4.2 The 5 responses received were all in support of keeping the JD Portsea North parking zone and are from residents who have no access to off road parking.

The parking zone is formed of 6 roads, containing 175 on-street parking spaces. The zone is heavily oversubscribed with 272 valid Resident permits. There are off-street parking spaces in the area that are owned and managed by the Housing & Property Service, to the rear of Privett House for example. Although finding a parking space within the JD zone remains difficult, residents have expressed concerns that parking would become impossible given the close proximity to the Historic Dockyard, Gunwharf Quays, University buildings and the residential redevelopment of the former Alders Warehouse site on Cross Street. From a strategic perspective, unrestricted parking in this location is impractical and the space is highly likely to become used for all-day parking by non-residents. There is currently no unrestricted parking in and around the city centre, in line with government policy.

4.4.3 JD permits are also valid within the JA zone south of Queen Street, which residents have reported as beneficial, particularly when space within the JD zone is unavailable. This opportunity would cease if the JD zone was removed.

5. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendation does not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010. These include Age, Disability, Race, Transgender, Gender, Sexual orientation, Religion or belief, relationships between groups, and other socially excluded groups.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 A proposed TRO must be advertised and the public given a 3 week consultation period where members of the public can register their support or objections. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account the comments received from the public during the consultation period.

7. Director of Finance Comments

7.1 The introduction of charges for all residents and other parking permits will mean that the costs of implementing and operating schemes will be mainly funded from the income generated.

7.2 The costs of the proposed amendments will be met from the annual budget that is set aside for this purpose. Any changes in income levels will be monitored and reported as required.

.....
Signed by:
Alan Cufley
Director of Transport, Environment & Business Support

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
T&T reports July 2015	Transport Planning, 4 th floor, Civic Offices Democratic Services, and Portsmouth City Council's website, search 'transportation', click 'Traffic & Transportation Committee' then 'Browse meetings...' and select date

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

.....
Signed by:
Cllr Ellcome
Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation

Summary of public consultation responses to TRO 55/2015 (AA Newbolt Road)

Objections to the proposed removal of AA Newbolt zone.

Petition submitted with 10 signatures from residents of odd Nos. 23-39 Newbolt Road

We, the undersigned, residents of the houses affected by this proposal, wish to register our OPPOSITION, to the removal of our permit spaces for the reasons set out below:

- This layby was provided originally, specifically for this group of houses, as it was recognised that unlike all the houses around, there was not enough kerb space for the residents to park and because of the green there was no way to make a driveway.
- Every other house in the area has full house frontage kerb-space (two spaces) and, in most cases, access to a driveway.
- In the evening, this kerb-space is fully utilised, as most of the houses around us seem to have at least two cars, and there are still people trying to find room to park. These drivers would be free to use our spaces, and the older residents and those with small children would find parking a distance from their homes very difficult. Cars parked at a distance would also be vulnerable to damage and residents might not feel safe parking and walking.
- At the moment there is a two hour maximum parking time allowed in these bays (except for residents with permits). This means that it is impossible to police this restriction, and it is badly abused, and although we have permits we still have to fight for our overnight parking space, even not going out in the evening in case there is no room to park on our return.
- We have seen an increasing number of large commercial vehicles parking in these places during the day and overnight and, this, whilst parking is supposed to be restricted. To remove this permit zone would encourage everyone with a large van or lorry into our spaces, and onto a road that is narrow anyway; becoming a serious danger to the adults and particularly children going to and from school and playgrounds. It is horrifying to see children in the middle of the road to get past these obstructions.

OUR PROPOSALS

- We need these parking spaces, and we would be severely disadvantaged if they became de-restricted
- We need control to be easier to apply and suggest that;
 - Each house is allocated a free numbered parking space (ideally) or
 - The cost for 1st permit could be cheaper with subsequent permits more expensive
 - The two hour maximum daytime parking time is retained.
 - An overnight curfew to be introduced for permit holders only. Perhaps from 1900hrs to 0800 hrs. This would stop Newbolt Road from becoming a lorry park, it could be easily policed, as any vehicle parked during that period without a permit could be identified, and the council could even generate revenue from parking fines.
 - Our need for these parking spaces is so great that we would be prepared to pay for them, although it would be an extra financial burden. We would like to feel that we have as much of a right to be able to park safely and at as little cost as those who have driveways and kerb space.

Resident, Newbolt Road

This house and the neighbouring houses are unable to create private parking in place of the front garden as many others have done on Newbolt Road, due to the grassed area in front. Therefore there is a greater need for access to the permitted parking in front of these homes. If the parking was unrestricted, the commercial vehicles would park here again.

Resident, Newbolt Road

At evenings and weekends, residents cannot park their cars near to their houses due to commercial vehicles parking in the bays all weekend, and householders carrying out regular car maintenance, which often takes up spaces for a whole day and sometimes all weekend. If the parking permits are removed then this will increase. Disabled visitors and relatives, who are unable to walk miles, also visit. If the permits are removed these relatives will be unable to visit due to parking worries. The parking zone should be permit holders 24/7, including visitor permits, for which residents would be happy to pay a yearly fee for.

Portsmouth City Council's response

This location is slightly unusual as the parking bays are on land owned by the Housing Service, but it has been adopted (maintained at public expense and with public right of access), which takes precedence over ownership. Therefore, it is not possible to number the bays, as that method of allocated parking is used in off-street private parking areas.

Permit charges are uniform across the parking zones citywide. The number of 1st Resident permits issued exceeds the number of 2nd Resident permits issued by 9:1, meaning the costs of parking zones would not be covered by permit income if 1st permits were cheaper and subsequent permits more expensive.

Under normal circumstances, a parking zone for a small section of road prohibiting its use by other residents of the same road would not be considered. Whilst some of the properties have turned their front gardens into off-road parking, there remains a similar number that are unable to do so, and therefore have to share kerb space and experience the difficulties described by the residents of Nos.23-39 in their petition and emails above. Parking is only available on one side of the road due to its width.

The recommendation to retain the parking zone restriction is made based on it being in place since 2004, and the support shown for it by the residents for whom it was implemented.

Summary of public consultation responses to TRO 56/2015 (AC Farmlea Road)

Support for removing the AC Farmlea Road parking zone
<p><u>Resident, Farmlea Road</u> I support the majority decision to remove the parking zone in Farmlea Road, as only residents and their visitors park in the road. It was much better before parking zone came into force and it would be a mistake to keep it.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Farmlea Road</u> The parking permits should be removed. Parking remains an issue but the permits don't make any difference. Would the restriction on the opposite side also be removed?</p>
<p><u>Resident, Farmlea Road</u> The scheme has not made any positive difference to the parking here. 2 hours for visitors is not long enough, especially when there are free spaces everywhere. The parking scheme turned many former spaces into single yellow lines which should be returned to unrestricted parking if the bays are removed. It is inconvenient to have to park on yellow lines, keep an eye out for a bay space and then move the car. I would prefer that the road had unrestricted parking once more.</p>

Objections to removing the AC Farmlea Road parking zone
<p><u>Resident, Farmlea Road</u> The possibility that the resident parking zone may be removed is a concern. The reasons that it was implemented back in 2012 (Port Solent workers parking there during the day) are still valid. There are limited options to park elsewhere when parking spaces near home are full. If the proposed nearby residential home is given planning permission, it will exacerbate the problems, and the situation will also worsen as local children reach driving age. I am willing to pay towards the administration costs of the scheme, and hope that consideration will be given to keeping it.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Southampton Road</u> As a disabled pensioner I struggle to be able to get out of a car inside the garage. Having a resident parking zone has helped to alleviate some of the problems with parking that come from Port Solent workers parking on residential streets. The proposed charge is reasonable if free parking isn't possible.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Farmlea Road</u> The issues that led to the zone being created are still valid and that the associated problems will return if the zone is removed. Cars park on double yellow lines and corners, which will worsen without the zone. People in rental properties are less likely to wish to pay for a permit, but if the zone is removed there will be a rise in complaints. If the removal goes ahead, could signage be left in place as a deterrent to those parking in residential streets for work? Without the zone, parking will be bad enough to force me to move from the area.</p>



Portsmouth City Council's response

See paragraphs 4.3.1 and 4.3.2.

Local employees using Farmlea Road to park is a daytime issue, when the majority of residents are out at work themselves and are largely unaffected. This is the main reason why two thirds of residents who expressed a view feel the parking zone is not worth paying for. In the evenings, the vehicles parking are associated with residents, who generally report no difference in parking availability.

A single yellow line was implemented in a few locations in Farmlea Road as residents previously parked partly on the pavement, which could not be legitimised within the parking zone. The daytime parking restriction on one side ensures traffic flow and access to the western end as the parking bays are marked opposite fully on the road. Should the parking zone be removed, this restriction would also be removed, returning the previous parking arrangements and experience.

Summary of public consultation responses to TRO 57/2015 (JD Portsea North)

Objections to removing the JD Portsea North parking zone

Resident, Cross Street

I was unaware that there was a survey conducted and question whether the 14 respondents who voted to remove the zone actually live or park in the relevant area. Where will I park if the zone is revoked? It is difficult to park at the best of times and taking this zone away will cause stress and anxiety for a great number of people.

There will also be a new housing development in Cross Street and the number of permits will increase once the properties are sold or let. The removal of the JD zone would put a lot of pressure on the JA residential parking area. I feel strongly that the majority of the 272 permit holders are unaware of the survey and of proposals; I am happy to pay for permits.

Resident, Cross Street

The prospect of removing the JD parking zone is deeply concerning. As a night time commuter who arrives home from work at around 1am, past the operational times of most public transport I am dependent on my car for work. Although never able to park within the JD zone when returning from work I am able to park in the JA zone opposite. Without the JD zone I will have nowhere to park. The proximity to Gunwharf and other visitor attractions could fill the limited number of spaces, as well as the potential influx of cars from the upcoming Aqua Development. The low number of respondents to the survey (17 out of 272 permit holders) does not give an accurate reflection of resident's opinions, and the survey questions did not fully address the issue. I am happy to pay for a Resident permit.

Resident, Cross Street

Repeal the plan to remove the JD parking zone, which would result in a great number of tourists from the Historic Dockyard parking in the area, preventing residents from doing so. The Dockyard car park is frequently full, with queues stretching back to Queen Street, and this deficit in visitor parking is a key reason to keep the RPZ. The low survey response rate equates to 6.25% and should not be used; the question should be put to residents again. The proposed charge for the first Resident permit is fair and reasonable, and is nothing compared to the potential cost of private parking.

Summary of public consultation responses to TRO 57/2015 (JD Portsea North) continued

Objections to removing the JD Portsea North parking zone

Resident, Cross Street

I and all of the other residents have been unaware of the consultation process - the majority are in favour of keeping the RPZ, contrary to the survey result. The cost of the permits and visitor permits is too high but would still prefer to keep the zone. All residents are to be kept informed of any further decisions.

Resident, Cross Street

It is difficult to park even with the zone, and this situation would deteriorate with the zone's removal. I am happy to pay the proposed fee; the survey results are inaccurate. It would have been preferable to contact current permit holders directly, as I didn't see the yellow notice until 24/08/2015 (last day of consultation).

Portsmouth City Council's response

See paragraphs 4.4.1, 4.4.2 and 4.4.3.

16 public notices were displayed within the 6 roads forming JD Portsea North (photographs of these in situ were taken) and yet only residents of Cross Street have responded. All respondents would prefer the parking zone remains in place, for the reasons reflected under the 'Reasons for the Recommendations' paragraph of this report.

The responses to the March/April 2015 survey came from residents of Cumberland Street (12 remove / 2 keep), King William Street (1 remove) and Queen Street (2 remove). The majority of those in Cumberland Street were residents of Privett House, which has parking spaces available to rent, and the 2 respondents from Queen Street are entitled to apply for permits within JD zone but may prefer those roads to be unrestricted.

Therefore, more weight has been given to the residents' views in response to the public consultation than the anonymous survey, as they have taken the time to write in and are directly affected by on-street parking availability.

(End of Report)