

<b>DECISION-MAKER:</b>	CABINET
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE A PERMIT PARKING SCHEME IN CHETWYND DRIVE, BASSETT (TRO)
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	20 DECEMBER 2010
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	HEAD OF HIGHWAYS AND PARKING SERVICES
<b>STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	
None.	

### **BRIEF SUMMARY**

A Traffic Regulation Order was proposed on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2010 to introduce a permit parking scheme in Chetwynd Drive. Following public consultation objections remain to the need for and cost of the scheme. The matter is therefore following due process in being brought to the Cabinet of the Council to consider and determine the objections to the permit parking scheme and if approved whether the scheme should operate annually or from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> May.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- (i) That the Cabinet approve the proposed permit parking scheme in Chetwynd Drive, as shown at Appendix 1.
- (ii) That if the scheme is approved the Cabinet decides that the permit parking restrictions should operate from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> May of each year.

### **REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That in the absence of overriding considerations, a survey of residents' views shows a convincing majority are in favour of introducing permit parking restrictions in Chetwynd Drive.
2. That if the scheme is approved, the majority of respondents to the survey preferred that the scheme operate from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> May of each year.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

3. Leaving the road unrestricted was rejected on the basis that it would not address residents' concern over obstruction and the level of university-related parking.

### **DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)**

4. A permit parking scheme was requested in Chetwynd Drive on 11<sup>th</sup> April by the East Bassett Residents' Association (EBRA). This followed an EBRA resident's survey in which 24 out of 25 respondents were in favour of permit holder parking. The Traffic Management team then drafted and advertised a signing only permit parking scheme (see Appendix 1) on 16<sup>th</sup> July.
5. As the pre-notice briefing letter for residents did not take into account a potential charge for visitors permits agreed at a Cabinet Meeting in July, it was decided to convey this information in a letter to all the residents together with responses to the points raised from the Public Notice (see Appendix 2/3).

6. A survey was also enclosed to confirm continued community support for a permit scheme and whether if approved residents would prefer a reduced period of operation from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> May. The results and comments from the survey are shown at Appendix 4.
7. The points from the Survey included:-
  - Concerns that a reduced period of operation would allow non-residents to park and potentially cause obstruction at the top of the road from June through to September.
  - Contrasting views that parking problems were not experienced outside of the university term.
  - Views that the scheme should apply over the Easter or Xmas term breaks.
  - An objection from a resident to paying for permits, taking into account existing Council Tax charges.
  - An objection to the introduction of any scheme of parking restrictions
  - Reference to the wider problems of noise and damage to Hall of Residence boundary fences from students using Chetwynd Drive.
  - The difficulties of accommodating visits by higher numbers of visitors on special occasions.
  - A question as to why permits have to be vehicle specific, which is restrictive for residents.
  - A question as to why no waiting at any time restrictions was not considered in the eastern section of the road, given that they were introduced in the top section.
  - A view that the scheme will only displace the student vehicles to other parts of Bassett causing further difficulties and costs.
  - Continued views that the University is responsible for parking problems and that the Council should be taking a range of actions to address this including; requiring adequate parking for students at all University sites and the prohibition of undergraduate students from having cars.
  - An alternative suggestion that other roads in the vicinity of the Halls of Residence are made unrestricted in order to accommodate the minority of students with vehicles. This in the residents' view would minimise the impact on residents (as students would park outside their own accommodation) and reduce the costs for the Council of managing and enforcing permit parking restrictions. Further that this approach should be tested before considering restrictions in Chetwynd Drive.

### **Officer Views**

8. The concerns and objections raised generally re-stated points raised in response to the Public Notice (see Appendix 3). Whilst the frustrations and expectations of residents are understandable in these circumstances the Council's powers are limited. The Government standards (PPG13) on parking provision for new developments or conversions are based on setting restrictive *maximum* limits to encourage sustainable travel. There is therefore no means of compelling the University to make provision for university-related

parking across its sites. Also with over 30,000 students studying in the city the Council would not wish encourage more vehicles to be brought into the city adding to congestion and carbon emissions. The Uni-Link bus service with 3m bus passengers per year is evidence of the scale of travel demand by this community. Whilst removing parking outside the Halls of Residence is outside the scope of these proposals, any future consideration of this would have to take this into account.

9. Otherwise subject to any future change in government standards or regulations, the introduction of permit parking restrictions is Council policy to address high levels on non-resident parking, subject to community support. Whilst displacement is a potential consequence of any scheme of parking restrictions it is not always possible to predict the scale and location. Council practice has been to support communities where and when difficulties arise. The design, administration and management of permit parking schemes is an additional net cost, that even with the possible addition of charges for Visitors permits would remain predominantly funded by the Council. Communities therefore requesting these measures have to take these costs into account when responding to the public consultation. Resident Permits are only allocated to specific vehicles to protect the integrity of the scheme and avoid permits being misused for non-resident vehicles. The No Waiting at Any Time restrictions in the upper section of Chetwynd Drive were introduced to protect the tree from high side vehicle impacts. We would not wish to generate further contention over different restrictions applying to different parts of the lower section.
10. Whilst the objections/concerns raised by a number of residents are appreciated, these do not in the view of the Traffic Management override the preference by 77% of residents for permit parking restriction. It is therefore recommended that the Cabinet approve the introduction of a permit parking scheme in Chetwynd Drive as proposed at Appendix 1, with an operating period from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> May (as supported by 54% of respondents) for the permit parking restrictions.

## **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Capital/Revenue**

11. The cost of the TRO, consultation, road signing and permit issue is estimated to be £6,000, which can be met from the Environment portfolio.

### **Property/Other**

12. N/A

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

### **Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:**

13. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 permits the introduction of the parking restrictions as set out in this report in accordance with a statutory consultation procedure set down in the Act and associated secondary legislation.

### **Other Legal Implications:**

14. In preparing and determining the proposals set out in this report the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of Equalities legislation, the Human Rights Act 1988 and s.17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (the duty to have regard to the need to remove or reduce crime and disorder in the area). It is considered that the proposals set out in this report are proportionate having regard to the wider needs of the area

### **POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

15. N/A

<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Name:	Graham Muir	Tel:	023 8038 8037
	E-mail:	graham.muir@bbisl.gov.uk		

**KEY DECISION?** No

<b>WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:</b>	Bassett
------------------------------------	---------

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line**

#### **Appendices**

1.	Map showing the proposals for a Permit Parking Scheme in Chetwynd Drive
2.	Covering Letter for the Survey following the Public Notice
3.	Summary of objections/concerns to the parking proposals from the Public Notice with a response from the Traffic Management team
4.	Results and Comments from the Survey of Chetwynd Drive residents

#### **Documents In Members' Rooms**

1.	N/A
2.	N/A

#### **Integrated Impact Assessment**

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	No
--	----

#### **Other Background Documents**

**Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:**

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	N/A	
----	-----	--