



NOTICE OF MEETING

TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL

FRIDAY, 22 JUNE 2018 AT 3PM

THE EXECUTIVE MEETING ROOM - THIRD FLOOR, THE GUILDHALL

Telephone enquiries to Jane Di Dino 023 9283 4060

Email: jane.didino@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

If any member of the public wishing to attend the meeting has access requirements, please notify the contact named above.

Members of the public who wish to make a deputation, please see the appropriate agenda item marked with an asterisk.

Membership

Councillor Simon Boshier (Chair)

Councillor Yahiya Chowdhury (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Ken Ellcome

Councillor Jason Fazackarley

Councillor Hugh Mason

Councillor Tom Wood

Standing Deputies

Councillor David Fuller

Councillor Ben Swann

Councillor Steve Wemyss

(NB This agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting).

Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: www.portsmouth.gov.uk

AGENDA

- 1 Apologies for Absence.
- 2 Declarations of Members' Interests
- 3 Minutes of the Previous Meeting. (Pages 3 - 6)

RECOMMENDED that the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record.

4 * Review of general parking issues in Portsmouth with a view to considering alternative strategies. (Pages 7 - 42)

Please note that the review will not consider the location or circumstances of individual residential parking zones, nor will it cover enforcement.

Requests to make a public deputation should be made in writing to the contact officer (above) by 12 noon of the working day before the meeting. Email requests are accepted. No person may speak for more than six minutes per deputation. Actual speaking times will depend on the number of deputations received.

The panel will continue its review of general parking issues in Portsmouth with a view to considering alternative strategies.

- Councillor Lynne Stagg, Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation will explain her priorities for her portfolio.
- The panel will consider the analysis of the responses to the parking survey.

Members of the public are now permitted to use both audio visual recording devices and social media during this meeting, on the understanding that it neither disrupts the meeting or records those stating explicitly that they do not wish to be recorded. Guidance on the use of devices at meetings open to the public is available on the council's website and posters on the wall of the meeting's venue.

Agenda Item 3

TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL

Minutes of the meeting of the Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel held on Wednesday, 20 September 2017 at 10am at the Civic Offices, Portsmouth

Present

Councillor Steve Hastings (in the Chair)
Paul Godier
Lee Hunt

13. Apologies for Absence. (AI 1)
Councillor Ian Lyon sent his apologies.

14. Declarations of Members' Interests (AI 2)
No interests were declared.

15. Minutes of the Previous Meeting. (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2017 be agreed as a correct record.

16. Review of general parking issues in Portsmouth with a view to considering alternative strategies. (AI 4)
Karen Nash, Portsmouth Pensioners included the following points in her deputation:

- The survey can be advertised in their magazine.
- Some areas of London have similar parking issues as Portsmouth. In the E2 zone temporary trade residential parking permits are given to residents for their contractors, there is free parking from Saturday evening to Monday morning and free bus passes are given to under 16s and pensioners. There is also a good mobile phone app which keeps residents informed on traffic issues.
- It is very difficult to park in Devonshire Avenue.

Steve Bonner, Portsmouth Pensioners included the following points in his deputation:

- He reiterated the offer to advertise the survey in their magazine which has a readership of 24,000.
- Commercial vehicles parking in residential areas is a concern.
- Students park in residential roads and leave them there for long periods.
- It might be useful to use B&Q and schools' car parks in the evenings.
- He asked the panel not to let the enormity of the problem deter it from attempting to deal with the problem.
- The withdrawal of free podiatry care has led to a decrease in people walking.

Adrian Reed included the following points in his deputation:

- There is no easy solution to the issue of parking because measures taken in one area impact other areas. It is important to explore the interconnection and take a holistic approach.
- The main cause of the problem is increasing car ownership.
- It is important to look at the vision for the city, the objectives and how these would be measured, the strategy and tactics.
- To support these objectives it would be necessary to increase viable alternatives; encourage employers to let staff work from home and build city infrastructure for tomorrow.

In response to questions from the panel, Pam Turton explained that:

The possibility of increasing off street parking had been explored with big shops and schools but there had been a degree of reluctance to participate.

Historically people in the North of the city didn't own as many cars. Now this area has some of the highest growth in car ownership.

Work is continuing with all council contractors particularly Colas. The first item on the agenda at the first meeting of the new PFI Manager was to address Colas vans parking on residential streets. A number of initiatives are being trialled to facilitate work in the city.

The telephone number for reporting urgent traffic management issues between 7am and 10pm could be more widely publicised.

Historically Portsmouth was very self-contained and people lived and worked here. This is no longer the case. People from Fareham East tend to work in Portsmouth and those from Fareham West in Southampton.

Southampton, Hampshire, the Isle of Wight and Portsmouth local authorities, the Department of Transport, bus companies and train companies are all working together to develop infrastructure for transport solutions.¹ Work is also underway on the South East Hampshire Bus Rapid Transport solution.

The council is promoting quieter, safer cycling routes. Over the last two years, the council has provided many initiatives to encourage cycling including helping people to buy and maintain their bicycles.

Members made the following observations:

It is important to lead by example, encourage more people to walk and reduce car ownership.

With 18,000 possible new homes being built in the city, car ownership is likely to increase significantly.

In response to concern raised about the number of houses of multiple occupation and students, it was explained that the Planning Committee must have strong grounds for refusing an application for houses of multiple

¹ <https://solentlep.org.uk/what-we-do/news/businesses-on-board-with-plans-for-solent-metro/>

occupation either for new ones or to increase the number of tenants. Parking is not a consideration.

At a previous meeting, representatives from Colas and Mountjoy had explained that they had taken measures to reduce the number of their vehicles that are parked on residential streets overnight to a minimum.

A recent residents' survey of parking carried out by the Liberal Democrats had an overwhelming response which shows that it is a significant concern.

There are four new loading bays for contractors only in Charles Dickens ward.

It is important not to demonise drivers who may have to park commercial vehicles on residential roads because it is the family's only transport. Everyone wants traders to come to our homes quickly when required.

More commercial vehicles parking could be provided with perhaps a council pool car taking groups on to their homes. There is one currently in Nancy Road and Curtain Car Park was previously used for this.

The My Portsmouth mobile phone app can be used to report traffic violations as well as other concerns.

Free seafront parking for people with residential parking permits could be offered.

A significant number of people drive into the city for work.

Some residents do not want a city-wide parking zone. It is important to listen to everyone.

The ongoing problems of vehicles parked for weeks at a time, those abandoned and the sale of cars on residential streets must be addressed.

Non-car owners could receive residents parking permits to give to their visitors.

Cycling and walking should be encouraged. It would be useful to investigate how often these modes of transport are used and for what purpose.

RESOLVED that:

- 1. The three top suggestions given by the focus group participants would inform the questions for the questionnaire. These are:**
 - **Move commercial vehicles from residential roads to other sites in the city.**
 - **Limit the number of HMOs - better liaison with planning and parking.**
 - **Make resident parking zones citywide.**
- 2. More information on the research carried out into evening off-street parking would be brought to a future meeting.**

The meeting concluded at 11.15 am.

Councillor Steve Hastings
Chair

Agenda Item 4

Portsmouth City Council Parking Scrutiny Consultation

Report title: Parking Scrutiny Quantitative Research Consultation

Report prepared by Market Research Officer

Date: 14/06/2018

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide members of the **Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel** (TECS) with resident feedback regarding the challenges of parking in the city. This consultation also gave residents the opportunity to provide insight and solutions that they feel might work.

2. Background

Portsmouth is a densely populated vibrant city with over 210,000 people living within the city boundaries. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) project this figure to increase over the coming years to around 215,000 people by 2020, making Portsmouth the most densely populated area outside of London.

Large areas of the city's housing is made up of Edwardian and Victorian terraced properties that do not have off-road parking. Available parking on the street generally equates to one space per property, but many households have two or more vehicles.

The city has a growing University population, with a transient population of approximately 25,000 students (UoP) each year. The University also employs around 2,500 full-time equivalent staff.

The city also attracts a large number of visitors to its world class attractions and major events, such as The Great South Run and Victorious Festival, which contribute to an increased demand for the limited supply of parking within the city.

Feedback suggests that residents are finding it harder to park, with some residents reporting that they do not move their cars during certain periods, particularly in the evenings when most people are at home.

Around 19% of the city's streets are within permit zones - in some areas this has caused enhanced parking problems in surrounding areas due to displacement, i.e. some of those living close to the boundary of a permit zone are parking in a non-permit zone to avoid charges.

The Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel began a review of parking in the city on 28 September 2016.

2.1 Objectives of the inquiry:

1. To understand and evaluate the current parking situation in the city which would include:
 - the legislative background
 - the management of supply and demand for parking, both on and off street
 - parking permits
 - parking of commercial vehicles in residential streets
2. To investigate how effectively other local authorities deal with parking issues.
3. To identify and evaluate possible long-term solutions.

2.2 Research

The scrutiny panel has worked to fulfil their objectives in a number of different ways. These have ranged from talking to professionals in the area of parking and traffic as well as inviting other councils to present their findings and demonstrate ideas they have implemented. Additionally, the committee used the experience of council officers to build a picture of the parking issues across the city.

However, Portsmouth has a number of unique features and therefore all the members of the committee believed it to be important to understand the feelings on the subject from Portsmouth residents.

Over the years, residents have been asked for their opinions on parking, often at a much localised level. It was therefore important that any further work was useful, covered new ground but also that those who participated could see the larger picture, i.e. that the parking problems they might be experiencing may be different in another location across the city.

The scrutiny panel requested a piece of research/consultation in order to further investigate the problems faced by residents and to explore any possible resident solutions.

The research element was undertaken in stages which culminated in a city-wide resident survey focusing on a number of key areas - further details are below.

3. Methodology

Following an initial short survey and a resident workshop, a long questionnaire was developed to focus questioning around areas that mattered to Portsmouth residents with regards to parking. These included: parking permits, commercial vehicle parking

and planning related parking issues. The committee also asked for sustainable transport-themed questions to be included in the questionnaire - the reason for this was to explore how the need for parking could be reduced and if sustainable transport was something residents had thus far considered.

The longer survey was open for 12 weeks to enable as many residents as possible time to complete it. Self-selection ensured all residents could participate and no individuals would feel excluded from the process.

To understand where residents lived and the demographic of participants, some demographic questions were included as well as residents' postcode information.

4. Response rates

Parking in the city is a widely discussed issue and it is not surprising that the survey attracted 2,963 responses. This volume of responses ensures a 99% confidence level with a margin of error of 2.4%.

5. Summary of findings

- The survey gained responses from all six outward postcodes (PO1-PO6), although the majority of responses were from residents in PO2 and PO4 areas.
- Two-person households were most responsive (40% of responses), one-person households were considerably lower than expected when compared to a Portsmouth household distribution estimate produced by the ONS.
- Most residents that interacted with the survey responded that they have one vehicle per household (49% of respondents) or two vehicles per household (39%), only 3% responded that they do not own a vehicle. This high level analysis shows that parking demand in Portsmouth outweighs parking supply.
- An overwhelming majority (82% of respondents) view parking as problematic whereas 16% of respondents do not view parking as a concern in Portsmouth.
- The general attitude to parking in Portsmouth does not vary by area - the majority of residents in all six outward postcode zones think parking is a problem in the city. However, these majorities do range from 68% in PO1 to over 90% in PO2.
- When asked to identify specific areas and streets which are most impacted by parking congestion - respondents highlighted the following: North End (the roads leading off Chichester Road, Powerscourt Road and Laburnum Grove), Southsea (the roads leading off Fawcett Road, Francis Avenue and Albert Road), Copnor (the roads leading off Stubbington Avenue and Mayfield Road), Fratton (the roads leading off Fratton Road).
- When asked to identify the cause of parking congestion across the city, the responses included: commercial vehicles parking on residential streets, poor parking - large spaces being left between cars, too many cars for on-street parking capacity, too many students/HMOs in the area, neighbouring roads having parking restrictions/permits which applies pressure in my area and people ignoring already existing parking restrictions.
- Attitude to parking varied slightly by residency inside or outside a parking zone area although clear majorities in both show that residents view parking as a problem - 85% of respondents living outside a permit area view parking as problematic, compared to 72% of residents inside parking zones.
- Attitude to parking zones and whether they have improved or not improved parking congestion is split with residents living in or near parking zones - 41% of respondents think parking zones have improved parking congestion, 41% think they have not improved parking congestion and 18% remain unsure.

- Attitude to parking zones varied by area and residency inside or near a parking zone. The only area that has a majority overall positive view of parking zones and the impact they have on parking congestion is PO6 and the only area with a majority overall negative view of parking permits is PO2.
- None of the potential options for relieving parking congestions which were presented in the survey received majority backing from respondents thinking they are a good idea and only one - promoting where parking is more readily available to help relieve congested areas - had a majority of respondents replying that it is not a good idea. This shows the public opinion of the resolution to Portsmouth's parking congestion is split.
- There is strong public opinion (77%-87% of respondents) to continue the four parking-related activities the council are currently undertaking which were presented in the survey.
- The majority of respondents (53%) think a household should be entitled to two parking permits.
- Specifically 5.5% of respondents park a commercial vehicle on a residential street - this varied by area, 6.8% of respondents in PO1 compared to 3.4% in PO5.
- 77% of respondents view commercial vehicles as a major contributor to parking congestion in Portsmouth. This varies by commercial vehicle ownership - 31% of owners think they are a major contributor compared to 80% of non-owners.
- There is clear support for the council providing dedicated parking for commercial vehicles with 74% of respondents thinking the council should.
- However, when the respondents who park their commercial vehicle on residential streets were asked if they would use designated commercial vehicle parking if it was provided by the council, approximately 55% responded 'unlikely' or 'very unlikely'.
- 86% of respondents think it is unacceptable for the council developments being granted planning permission without parking provisions - only 7% think it is acceptable and 7% are unsure.
- The two main ways that bus use could be encouraged among respondents is 'lower travel costs' and 'more frequent/reliable sources' with 52% and 48% of respondents respectively.
- The responses for ways of encouraging cycling across Portsmouth show that 'Improve cycle routes' is the most popular response with 34% of respondents selecting this option and 'Increase/install cycle routes' is second most common with 27% of respondents.

- Public opinion is in favour of having a 'Try it for free - public transport day' with 53% of the respondents selecting this as an option they think would successfully encourage residents to use alternative forms of transport and not drive their cars.
- Demographic analysis was undertaken and found that slightly more females and age groups in the middle of the age group distribution interacted with the survey more.

Full breakdowns are available in the following section of this report.

6. Analysis of results

The following sections outline the analysis undertaken on the results from the Parking Scrutiny Survey (PSS) which was conducted at the request of the Traffic, Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel (TECS).

It is divided into the following five sections:


- General analysis
- Parking permits
- Commercial vehicles
- Planning related parking
- Respondent demographics

6.1 General analysis

This section explores basic postcode information of respondents, household size distribution, number and type of vehicles per household and general attitude to parking in Portsmouth.

Analysis of the postcode information provided by the respondents of the Parking Scrutiny Survey (PSS) is presented in Figure 1. It shows that residents from each outward postcode interacted with the survey, although, the majority of respondents are residents in PO2 (28%) and PO4 (26%).

Figure 1: Respondents by outward postcode



Notes:


Respondents = 2,882

Only postcodes PO1-PO6 (only postcodes within the boundaries of Portsmouth City Council are included)

Source: Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 2 shows the household size distribution for the respondents of the PSS. These results show that the largest proportion of responses (approximately 40%) are from two-person households; three and four person households are next most prevalent (about 20% each); one-person households account for about 12% of the responses and five-person and more than five person households combined represent about 7% of the responses to the survey.

Figure 2: Household size distribution




Notes:

Respondents = 2,937

Source: Parking Scrutiny Survey

To check how representative this household size distribution is, the results from the PSS were compared with estimates produced by the Office for National Statistics (ONS), this comparison is presented in Figure 3. The ONS only produce official statistics for household size by local authority for census years (last census was 2011 which is not recent enough to be used a reliable comparator), as a result the estimates produced from a [Research Output](#) published in March 2018 have been used. The local authority distributions produced in this output use the Annual Population Survey (APS) to adjust administrative data estimates for 2016 data (this is the most up-to-date output). While these are not official statistics and cannot be treated as "gold standard", they are the best option available for an intercensal year and provide a fairly accurate household size distribution for the city.

Figure 3: Household size distribution - PSPS and ONS estimates comparison



Notes:

Source: Parking Scrutiny Survey and Office for National Statistics - Research Output: An update on producing household statistics for an Administrative Data Census¹.

The comparison in Figure 3 shows that the household size distribution of the respondents of the PPS is not wholly representative of the household size distribution in Portsmouth. It suggests that one-person households were noticeably less responsive to the survey and as a result it appears that there is a larger proportion of two-person households than the ONS estimate suggests exist in the city. It is likely a one-person household generally has less interaction with the parking services and therefore is less likely to engage with a parking specific survey. Although the three, four and five person and over households show different proportions to the ONS estimates (this is likely due to the lack of one-person households responding to the survey), they show a similar trend - proportions of each household size decrease as the number of people per household increases.


The results from the survey showed that the majority of residents own either one or two vehicles per household with 49% and 39% of respondents selecting these replies respectively (see Figure 4). As previously mentioned, the on-street parking space to household ratio is 1:1 in a lot of areas across the city, therefore it is clear from this high level analysis alone that the parking demand outweighs the parking supply in Portsmouth.

Only 3% of the households that responded to the survey do not own a single vehicle. However, this is not likely to be representative of the vehicle ownership across the city

¹ The Research Outputs are NOT official statistics on the population. Rather they are published as outputs from research into an Administrative Data Census approach. These outputs must not be reproduced without this disclaimer and warning note, and should not be used for policy- or decision-making

because an individual that does not own a vehicle and therefore interact with parking services is far less likely to respond to a parking-specific survey.

Figure 4: Number of vehicles per household




Notes:

Respondents = 2,963

Source: Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 5 shows the vehicle type breakdown and the number of each vehicle type at households in Portsmouth. Unsurprisingly, the survey results suggest that cars are the most common vehicle type in the city with 58% of responding households owning one car and 36% of responding households owning two cars. Again this high level analysis shows that car parking demand outweighs car parking supply in Portsmouth. The results also show that 10% of households own one van and about 5% of households own one motorcycle.

Figure 5: Vehicle type per household




Notes:

Respondents = 2,633

Source: Parking Scrutiny Survey

The analysis of residents' attitude to parking across the city showed that an overwhelming majority (82% of respondents) view parking as problematic whereas 16% do not view parking as a concern in Portsmouth (see Figure 6). However, it is again worth noting the issue of engagement with a parking-specific survey and the possibility that residents who view parking more negatively are more likely to interact with a parking scrutiny survey.


Figure 6: Attitude to parking in Portsmouth



Notes:
Respondents = 2,697
Source: Parking Scrutiny Survey

The general attitude to parking in Portsmouth does not vary by area. As Figure 7 shows, the majority of residents in all six outward postcode zones think parking is a problem in the city. However, these majorities do range from 68% in PO1 to over 90% in PO2.

Figure 7: Attitude to parking in Portsmouth, by outward postcode



Notes:

Respondents = 2,556

Source: Parking Scrutiny Survey

When asked to identify specific areas and streets which are most impacted by parking congestion, the responses in order of popularity were the following:

1. North End (the roads leading off Chichester Road, Powerscourt Road and Laburnum Grove)
2. Southsea (the roads leading off Fawcett Road, Francis Avenue and Albert Road)
3. Copnor (the roads leading off Stubbington Avenue and Mayfield Road)
4. Fratton (the roads leading off Fratton Road)

NB: About 30% of respondents replied with 'all roads in Portsmouth' or something similar.

When asked to identify the cause of parking congestion across the city, the responses in order of popularity were as follows:

1. Commercial vehicles parking on residential streets
2. Poor parking - large spaces being left between cars
3. Too many cars for on-street parking capacity
4. Too many students/HMOs in the area


5. Neighbouring roads having parking restrictions/permits which applies pressure in my area
6. People ignoring already existing parking restrictions

6.2 Parking Zone analysis

As mentioned previously, one of the key findings from the focus groups was parking zones. The following section provides the results and analysis of the parking zone section of the Parking Scrutiny Survey (PSS).

As outlined in Section 2, around 19% of the city streets in Portsmouth are within parking zones, as Figure 8 shows, 17% of the respondents of the PPS live in parking zone areas across the city. These results show that the survey responses are fairly representative of the city as a whole with regards to residency inside or outside of parking zones.

Figure 8: Parking zone residency




Notes:

Respondents = 2,531

Source: Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 9 shows that 85% of respondents living outside parking zones view parking as problematic compared to 72% of respondents that live within parking zones. Although there is this variation around the citywide average of 81% (see Figure 8), it is clear that the majority of residents think on-street parking is problematic in both areas with and without parking permits.

Figure 9: Attitude to parking in Portsmouth by parking zone residency (living inside or outside a parking zone)




Notes:

Respondents = 2,482

Source: Parking Scrutiny Panel Survey

As previously mentioned, one of the popular responses for why parking is a problem in the city was 'neighbouring roads having parking restrictions/permits which applies pressure in my area'. Figure 10 shows that 33% of the respondents that do not live **in** a parking zone replied that they live **near** a parking zone.

Figure 10: Residency near a parking zone




Notes:

Respondents = 2,521

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

It is clear from the analysis of the residents' attitude towards parking zones that public opinion is divided; 41% of respondents think the parking zones have improved parking congestion whereas 41% think that they have not improved parking issues and 18% of respondents remain unsure.

Figure 11: Attitude to parking zones (live in or near parking zone)



Notes:

Respondents = 433


Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 12 shows that attitude to parking zones by area and parking zone residency. The results highlight that the only area that has a majority overall positive view of parking zones and the impact they have on parking congestion is residents in PO6: 60% of respondents living in parking zones and 57% of respondents living near parking zones think they have improved parking congestion in the area.

In contrast, the only area with a majority overall negative view of parking permits is PO2. Over 50% of both residents living in and near parking zones in PO2 think that parking zones have not improved parking congestion in the area.

Generally across all outward postcodes slightly more residents living in parking zones think parking zones have improved parking congestion, compared to those living near parking zones. PO1 is an exception to this trend. The largest difference between those living in parking zones and those living near parking zones is seen in PO4. 59% of respondents living in parking zones and 45% of respondents living near parking zones think they have improved parking congestion in PO4.

Figure 12: Attitude to parking zones by outward postcode and parking zone residency (in or near a parking zone)



Notes:

Respondents = 431

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Parking zones are usually introduced at the request of residents. The survey asked for opinions on the following potential options for relieving parking congestion:

Option A: Roll out a 24 hr parking zone across the entire city


Option B: Roll out parking zones that are enforceable between 08:30-18:30

Option C: Roll out parking zones that are enforceable between 08:30-20:30

Option D: Remove all parking zones

Figure 13 shows the results from the survey where these options were proposed to residents. The option of rolling out a 24 hour parking zone across the entire city (option A) was the most popular of all four options, however, only 37% of respondents thought this was a good idea. Removing all parking zones (option D) was the most unpopular proposed solution with only 25% of respondents approving this idea and 51% disapproving this option.

Figure 13: Attitude to proposed parking options



Notes:

Respondents = 2,386

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

The council is currently undertaking various parking-related activities, some of which are summarised below. As part of the consultation process, the scrutiny panel wanted to understand public opinion of these activities. As a result, a question was included which asked respondents if they think the council should continue or stop the following activities:


Activity A: Reviewing the use of disabled parking bays

Activity B: Reviewing painting of restricted zones

Activity C: Reviewing under-used parking spaces

Activity D: Promoting where parking is more readily available to help relieve congested areas

Figure 14: Attitude to Council's current parking scrutiny activity




Notes:

Respondents = 2,403

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 14 shows that public opinion is strong in favour of continuing all four of the parking-related activities that the council is currently undertaking. The support for these options ranged from 77-87% of respondents.

Figure 15: Parking permit entitlement



Notes:

Respondents = 2,403

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

The majority of people who interacted with the PSS (53%) responded that they think each household should be entitled to two parking permits, see Figure 15. Although, a substantial proportion (32%) think that a household should be restricted to an individual permit per address. Only 14% of respondents think households should be eligible for three or more permits.

The council have already increased the cost of applying for an additional permit. The scrutiny panel wanted to get feedback from respondents on the options below for reducing parking permit requests. Figure 16 shows the results of this.


Option A: Increase costs further for additional permits

Option B: Encourage people to use alternative methods of transport and therefore reduce the need for many vehicles

Option C: Encourage people to let others use garages, space on driveways, hard-standings or allocated parking spaces that they do not need themselves

Option D: Allocate spots on street

Figure 16: Resident opinion to options for reducing permit requests



Notes:


Respondents = 2,308

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

It is clear from Figure 16 that allocating spots on the streets and encouraging people to let others use garages and parking spaces that they do use themselves (option C and D), are the most popular of the options presented with about 47% of respondents thinking they would be suitable options for reducing parking permit requests.

Increasing costs further and encouraging alternative means of transport are less popular with around 37% of respondents.

Figure 17: Resident opinion to non-car owners buying permits for visitors



Notes:

Respondents = 2,362


Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 17 shows that 62% of respondents agree that residents should be allowed to buy parking permits even if they do not own a car themselves, whereas about a quarter (26%) of respondents do not agree.

6.3 Commercial vehicle analysis

As previously mentioned (see Section 3), the second key area identified from the focus group activities was commercial vehicles. The following section presents the analysis of the commercial vehicles questions in the Parking Scrutiny Survey (PSS).

Figure 18: Proportion of respondents that park commercial vehicle on residential streets




Notes:

Respondents = 2,340

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

The results of the survey show that only about 6% (specifically 5.52%) of respondents park a commercial vehicle on a residential street, see Figure 18. The commercial vehicle parking trends are also analysed at lower geographical level to explore if there are areas more impacted by commercial vehicle parking. As Figure 19 shows, the percentage of respondents that park a commercial vehicle on a residential street varies by area. PO1, PO2 and PO4 all had a slightly higher proportion of people parking commercial vehicles on residential streets compared to the city wide average of 5.52% (see orange line on Figure 19). In contrast, PO3 and PO5 both have proportions lower than this average with PO5 having the lowest percentage at 3.5%.

Figure 19: Proportions of respondents that park commercial vehicle on residential streets by outward postcode




Notes:

Respondents = 2,298

Only postcodes PO1-PO6 (within the boundaries of Portsmouth City Council are included)

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 20: Public opinion of commercial vehicles in relation to parking congestion



Notes:


Respondents = 2,323

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

The results from the analysis of the commercial vehicle public opinion with regards to parking congestion (see Figure 20) show that a clear majority of respondents (77%) think commercial vehicles are a major contributor to parking congestion in Portsmouth. Only 11% of respondents do not think vehicles of this type are a major contributor. These results are in line with the replies presented in Section 6.2 which listed commercial vehicles parking on residential roads as a popular response to public opinion of the causes of parking congestion in Portsmouth.

Figure 21 shows the same public opinion breakdown by commercial vehicle 'ownership'. This further analysis shows that there is great variation in opinion towards commercial vehicles being major contributors to parking congestion between 'owners' and 'non-owners' of vehicles of this type. A large majority (80%) of 'non-owners' view commercial vehicles as a major contributing factor to parking congestion in the city whereas only 9% of 'non-owners' do not. This is contrast with 31% of 'owners' thinking commercial vehicles do contribute to parking congestion compared to 54% thinking they do not.

Figure 21: Public opinion of commercial vehicles in relation to parking congestion, by commercial vehicle 'ownership'



Notes:


Respondents: 'owners' = 131, 'non-owners' = 2,192

Where 'owner' = answered yes to 'Do you park a commercial vehicle on a residential street?' and 'non-owner' answered no. 'Non-owners' could therefore include owners who park their commercial vehicle off road.

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey


Figure 22 shows that there is strong public support for the council to consider providing dedicated parking areas for commercial vehicles with 74% of respondents. Only 12% of respondents do not think the council should explore this option and 15% remain unsure.

Figure 22: Public opinion of whether the council should consider providing dedicated parking for commercial vehicles



Notes:
Respondents = 2,309
Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 23: Likelihood of people who park their commercial vehicles on residential streets using designated commercial vehicle parking if provided by the council



Notes:

Respondents = 129


Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Although there is this overall support for the council exploring designated commercial vehicle parking, as Figure 23 shows, when asked if they would consider parking their commercial vehicles in designated parking areas instead of on residential streets, the responses from commercial vehicles owners vary somewhat. The most common response with approximately 42% of commercial vehicle owners is 'very unlikely' and when combined with 'unlikely' (about 12%), there is an overall negative opinion (54%) to designated commercial vehicle parking. This compares to approximately 35% of commercial vehicle owners whose response is positive towards using designated commercial vehicle parking areas if they were provided across Portsmouth (very likely: 13%, likely 22%).

Planning related parking analysis

The final area identified from the focus group activities was planning related parking, the following section outlines the analysis of planning related question in the Parking Scrutiny Survey (PSS).

Figure 24: Public opinion of council developments being granted planning permission without parking provisions



Notes:

Respondents = 2,300

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

As Figure 24 shows, a vast majority of respondents (86%) think it is unacceptable for the council to authorise development when parking provisions are not accounted for. Only 7% of the respondents to the survey view this as acceptable.


A large proportion of the open ended responses to a following question which asked the respondent how the council could encourage residents of new development not to own a car include improving public transport links, reducing public transport cost and making cycling safer across the city.

Alternative transport analysis

The following section focusses on respondents' attitude to alternative forms of transport.

As Figure 25 shows, that two main ways that bus use could be encouraged among residents is 'Lower travel costs' and 'More frequent / reliable sources' with 52% and 48% of respondents respectively selecting these options. The third most popular option, although with far less responses (23%) is 'A single travel card for travel on different transport in the area'.

Figure 25: Public opinion on encouraging bus use in Portsmouth




Notes:

Respondents = 2,212

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 26: Public opinion on encouraging cycling in Portsmouth




Notes:

Respondents = 2,156

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

The responses for ways of encouraging cycling across Portsmouth show that 'Improve cycle routes' is the most popular response with 34% of respondents selecting this option and 'Increase/install cycle routes' is second most common with 27% of respondents - see Figure 26. 17% of respondents 'Already cycle to work/to get around the city' and 35% are reluctant to change responding that 'nothing would encourage me to cycle more' or 'I already travel sustainably'.

Figure 27: Public opinion on encouraging walking in Portsmouth




Notes:

Respondents = 2,199

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

As Figure 27 shows, the majority of respondents (68%) 'Already walk'; for 16% of respondents it is 'Not applicable as it is too far to walk' and the most common option for encouraging walking is 'Improve lighting' although only 17% of respondents selected this option.

Figure 28: Public opinion on encouraging alternative forms of transport and discouraging driving



Notes:


Respondents = 1,998

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Public opinion is in favour of having a 'Try it for free - public transport day' with 53% of the respondents selecting this as an option they think would successfully encourage residents to use alternative forms of transport and not drive their cars. 'Better cycling facilities' and 'Ability to access a bus route' are also options that appear relatively popular with 36% and 30% of respondents respectively selecting them as viable options (see Figure 28).

Respondent demographic analysis

Figure 29: Gender distribution of respondents




Notes:

Respondents = 2,198

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Generally speaking, more women tend to complete questionnaires, therefore the gender split this year 51% female and 44% male, see Figure 29, is not only comparable with last year but is common with consultation more generally as well.

Figure 30: Age distribution of respondents



Notes:


Respondents = 2,205

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

It is expected that there are slightly more responses from those aged over 45 during public consultation, therefore the age distribution of respondents is again within expected limits, 51% are aged 45 and over, see Figure 30. This however does raise concern for how representative the respondents are of the city as a whole. Estimates produced in a [Research Output](#) from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) support this. Figure 31 shows when the age distribution of the survey respondents is compared to the estimates produced from administrative data sources there are some clear differences. As expected, the younger residents interacted far less with the survey than older age groups with only 4% of respondents being aged 18 to 24 whereas the estimate from ONS suggests this age group make up about 17% of Portsmouth's population.

It is important to note that the estimates produced in this [Research Output](#) are not official statistics, they are the most up-to-date in a series of outputs which use administrative data to produce estimates. While they cannot be treated as "gold standard" they are the best available estimates for a non-census year (in this case, 2016) and provide a relatively accurate insight into the age distribution across the city. The output reports that the quality of the estimates for Portsmouth are within 1% of official estimates (which are not published at local authority level).


Figure 31: Age distribution of respondents compared with ONS estimates



Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey and Office for National Statistics (ONS)
 NB: the estimates used from ONS are not official statistics, they are produced in this [Research Output](#)².

² The Research Outputs are NOT official statistics on the population. Rather they are published as outputs from research into an Administrative Data Census approach. These outputs must not be reproduced without this disclaimer and warning note, and should not be used for policy- or decision-making

Figure 32: Respondents' household income distribution




Notes:

Respondents = 2,178

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

Figure 32 shows that nearly one quarter of respondents (23%) 'Prefer not to say' what their household income is. Of the remaining three quarters of respondents the household income distribution is fairly spread across the income bands. The most popular response is £15,000-£24,999 with £25,000-£34,999 and £35,000-£44,999 second and third most common respectively.

Figure 33: Respondents' employment status




Notes:

Respondents = 2,179

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

The majority of respondents (71%) are employed in one form or another, this includes full-time employment (52%), part time employment (12%) and self-employed (7%) individuals, see Figure 33. The second most common breakdown of the employment status of the survey respondents is retired (15%). Considering Portsmouth is a university city, there are few students interacting with the survey (only 2% of respondents), although these results are in line with the age distribution in Figure 30.

Figure 34: Respondents' disability status




Notes:

Respondents = 2,191

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

As Figure 34 shows, the vast majority of respondents (86%) indicated that they did not have a disability.

Figure 35: Respondents' ethnicity



Notes:

Respondents = 2,191

Source: Portsmouth Parking Scrutiny Survey

The majority of those responding identified themselves as white British, see Figure 35. This is again in keeping with responses to previous local consultation.