



Title of meeting: Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation
Decision Meeting

Date of meeting: 2 September 2021

Subject: Residents' Parking Programme of Consultation -
Reprioritisation

Report by: Tristan Samuels, Director of Regeneration

Wards affected: All

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. The purpose of the report is to provide an update on the progress of the Residents' Parking Programme of Consultation since August 2020 and to make recommendations on the way forward.

Within this report, RPZ means Residents' Parking Zone and TRO means traffic regulation order

Appendix A: Citywide map of RPZ requests 2015 - 2021

Appendix B: The RPZ and TRO process in more detail, for information

Appendix C: Residents' Parking Programme map; a visual representation of existing RPZs and the areas identified for consultation within this report

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- (a) The progress made since August 2020 (paragraph 3.4), and the conclusion of the rolling element of the programme (paragraph 3.6) is noted and that the rolling programme of consultation has been completed;
- (b) The Programme set out in Table 1 (page 4) is agreed, meaning consultation recommences with the 5 self-contained* areas identified (*those unlikely to displace parking, and which have been waiting for some years to be considered whilst the rolling programme reached its conclusion);



- (c) Once work in the 5 self-contained areas in Table 1 is complete, the remaining 4 areas on the Programme are progressed and a rolling element again developed to mitigate any displaced parking impact;**
- (d) Once work described in (c) above is complete, the review of existing parking zones recommences to ensure their optimal operation for permit holders, with a new Programme developed based on the demand from residents.**

3. Background

- 3.1.** On the 6 September 2019 a reprioritised Residents' Parking Programme of Consultation was agreed by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation, in response to the Full Council motion passed on: 16 July 2019:

The Council...therefore calls on the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation to draw up and publish a strategic plan for the management of parking in residential and non-residential areas covering a period of at least five years.

- 3.2.** Subsequent RPZ Programme reports, including this one, adhere to that motion and reiterate the strategy developed for evaluating requests for new RPZs citywide, prioritising them via a scoring matrix and promptly addressing issues of displaced parking as part of a rolling programme.
- 3.3.** The Programme outlined in the report from August 2020 has progressed well, despite national lockdowns affecting statutory consultations, Council services and its external contractors. Much has been achieved under challenging circumstances.

- 3.4.** Progress between August 2020 and July 2021:

- 3 large RPZs were introduced following formal consultation (MG, MH, MI)
- 1 RPZ was extended, following formal consultation (MF)
- 3 informal surveys were undertaken (GB extension area, MJ, NC)
- 2 further formal consultations were undertaken (GB extension, MH extension - part of the area surveyed under "MJ")

- 3.5.** The informal survey of the "NC Kingsley Road area" showed that the majority of residents who replied did not feel a parking zone would be useful. The full results are on the Council's website on the "parking survey results" page, and headline results are as follows:

- 209 out of 736 (28%) forms were returned
- 84 (40%) respondents felt a parking zone would be useful
- 111 (58%) respondents felt a parking zone would not be useful
- 14 (7%) did not answer either way.

- 3.5.1.** As local people are not in favour of a parking zone, formal proposals are not required to be drawn up for consultation.



- 3.6.** Consequently, the rolling programme has reached a point where support has ended, and parking will not be displaced by further zones. The rolling element therefore ceases, as specified in previous reports which indicated the rolling programme would continue until a point is reached where an RPZ is not needed or supported by residents.

4. Programme Development

- 4.1.** The rolling programme was developed so that when a Residents' Parking Zone (RPZ) was agreed in one area the adjacent area or areas would be surveyed so that the effect of any displacement of parked cars could be mitigated quickly. This has worked and minimised the time residents in adjoining areas are affected by any displacement. However it has also meant that efforts have been focused across one area of the city.
- 4.2.** To enable other areas to be consulted the RPZ programme has been reviewed. It is proposed to first consult areas that are unlikely to cause significant displacement, as these can be done without the need for a rolling programme. There are a number of such areas on the existing programme namely FI Doyle Court, FJ Stamshaw, KE Pembroke Park, JG Froddington, JH Railway View.
- 4.3.** Since July 2019 a scoring matrix has been used to help determine the order. No scoring matrix can completely capture the situation but by scoring factors which affect the ability to park and the desire for parking controls it can help in the difficult decision regarding prioritisation. The scoring matrix is an indicative mechanism to prioritise requests, and has been amended slightly to enable a greater degree of fairness overall.
- 4.4.** Requests for parking zones are received regularly from residents and over the years appropriate areas have been identified for consultation. As the rolling programme has reached a conclusion, the opportunity to offer an RPZ to residents in these areas can be accommodated within a new timetable. Appendix A - Citywide map of RPZ requests 2015 - 2021 illustrates from where the requests are received.
- 4.5.** Rather than considering the absolute number of requests, the matrix now reflects the percentage of households in an area that have expressed the desire for permit parking. In addition, the points awarded for areas with fewer than 50% of properties with off-street parking has increased from 2 to 3. Areas fewer than 50% of properties with off-street parking have a greater reliance on having space available on-street and are therefore likely to be impacted more by non-residents' parking.
- 4.6.** Table 1 below shows how the areas identified for consultation score under the revised priority matrix.

Table 1 - Priority Matrix

	Self-contained Areas						Displacement / Rolling Programme Needed			
	FI Doyle	FJ Stamshaw	KE Pembroke	JG Froddington	JH Railway		GC Shearer	BG Mulberry	AB Wymering	BC Cosham
Requests from 5% (1 point)		1		1	1		1		1	
Requests from 10% (2 points)			2				2			
Requests from 15% (3 points)	3									
>50% of properties have no access to off street parking (3 points)	3	3					3			
>50% of properties have a frontage width of under 5m (2 points)		2		2			2			
Area located within 500m of a major trip generator (shopping centre, hospital, leisure venue, educational facility, tourist area, large employer) (1 point per trip generator)	6	4	7	5	4		5	3	3	
Area located within 500m of a transport hub (railway station, bus station, ferry terminal, hovercraft) (2 points per interchange without parking, 1 point per interchange with parking)		1	2	2	2		1			
Total	12	11	11	10	7		11	6	4	

4.7. Taking the information from Table 1 a programme has been drawn up (Table 2 below). The timetable has been divided into quarterly windows in which to commence the RPZ and potential TRO process for each area, depending on what residents tell us. The indicative timescales represent the most effective utilisation of resources in delivering positive outcomes to the community.

4.8. The areas for consultation set out in Table 2 below have been prioritised by scoring them against the Priority Framework Matrix shown in Table 1 above. Appendix C RPZ Programme Map shows areas where RPZs are active and the areas to be proposed for development within Table 1.

Table 2

I = informal survey F = formal consultation

	Year	2021/22		2022/23	
	Quarter	2 July August Sept	3 Oct Nov Dec	4 Jan Feb March	1 April May Jun
GB Alverstone Rd area extension		F			
MH Westfield Rd area extension		F			
FI Doyle Court Service Road, Hilsea		I	F		
FJ Stamshaw North, Nelson		I	F		
KE Pembroke Park, St Thomas			I	F	
JG Froddington, Charles Dickens			I	F	
JH Railway View area, Charles Dickens			I	F	
GC Shearer Road area, Fratton				I	F

Key
Current Programme
Self-contained areas: unlikely to cause displacement
Area requires a rolling programme



- 4.9.** The development of an RPZ follows a fairly extensive process as set out in Appendix B, particularly when working on more than one parking zone at a time. However, the average time of 36 weeks set out in the T&T report of September 2011 has been reduced to 20-26 weeks in subsequent years, due to new technologies and improved resources.
- 4.10.** Once the self-contained areas within Table 1 have progressed to conclusion, it is proposed to consider the areas which may require a rolling programme. Of these (GC, BG, AB extension, BC extension):
- a positive response to the informal survey would mean a rolling programme of consultation is developed for the adjacent unrestricted areas;
 - a negative response to the informal survey will mean the next area on the list will be considered and receive an informal survey.

5. Reasons for recommendations

- 5.1.** With car ownership in Portsmouth showing a steady increase over recent years, there is increasing pressure on the availability of on-street residential parking spaces.
- 5.2.** RPZs can improve residents' opportunities of finding a parking space near to their homes. In some locations residents can spend a considerable time driving around streets looking for a space, which creates wasted mileage, associated costs and air pollution.
- 5.3.** All requests for RPZs from residents are recorded and collated. Each area requires careful consideration according to the particular needs of the residents. The recommendations are presented to provide a systematic way of reviewing requests for zones and addressing any displacement issues while considering the needs on an area by area basis.
- 5.4.** The review of existing parking zones for the purpose of optimising their operation for residents and businesses, will recommence when resources allow. This element has not been removed from the Programme, but short-term timescales are not available for publication at this time.

6. Integrated Impact Assessment

- 6.1.** An Integrated Impact Assessment is not required at this stage as the report does not put forward any proposals to change restrictions and the recommendations do not have a disproportionate negative impact on any of the specific protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010. Each subsequent new proposal will be subject to public consultation and a separate report that assesses any impact on the Equalities Groups.

7. Legal implications

7.1. As the recommendations do not propose any further action at this stage there are no legal implications. Any alterations or additions to the existing traffic regulations orders will require approval in the usual way.

8. Director of Finance's comments

8.1. There are no direct financial consequences of the approving the recommendations within this report.

8.2. Any costs associated with the implementing new schemes or evaluating existing schemes will be met from the On Street Parking budget.

8.3. As individual schemes are designed a separate report for each will be brought back to the Traffic and Transport portfolio decision meeting that sets out the cost of implementing and operating the scheme, and an estimate of the likely revenue that may accrue to the Parking Reserve.

.....
Signed by:

- Appendices:**
- A) Citywide map of RPZ requests 2015 - present
 - B) RPZ process
 - C) Residents' Parking Programme map

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
Residents' Parking Programme of Consultation - Reprioritisation Post Covid-19	PCC website - Traffic and Transportation cabinet meetings - 20 August 2020
Residents' Parking Programme of Consultation - Reprioritisation	PCC website - Traffic and Transportation cabinet meetings - 6 September 2019
Residents' Parking Programme of Consultation Update	PCC website - Full Cabinet meetings - 26 February 2019
TECS Parking Review	PCC website - Full Cabinet meetings - 26 February 2019
Revised Residents' Parking Programme of Consultation	PCC website - Traffic and Transportation cabinet meetings - 31 July 2018
Residents' Parking Zones to be retained/amended	PCC website - Traffic and Transportation cabinet meetings - 15 July 2015



Residents' Parking Zones to be removed/reduced/amended	PCC website - Traffic and Transportation cabinet meetings - 15 July 2015
Update and Revision of 3-year Residents' Parking Programme	PCC website - Traffic and Transportation cabinet meetings - 22 September 2011

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

.....
Signed by:

(End of report)