

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
SUBJECT:	PROPOSED RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME, HOLYROOD ESTATE (TRO)
DATE OF DECISION:	16 APRIL 2012
REPORT OF:	HEAD OF NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
N/A	

BRIEF SUMMARY

Following the successful introduction of a Residents' Parking scheme on the Kingsland estate in Southampton City Centre, Housing Services have proposed to introduce a similar scheme in the off-street parking areas in the Holyrood estate as part of wider plans to enhance the community's environment. The proposal to introduce a Permit Parking scheme was advertised on 10 February 2012, with a closing date of 2 March 2012. One objection and a petition objecting to the proposed scheme have been received.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) To consider and determine the objection to the proposed Permit Parking scheme in the off-street parking areas in Holyrood Estate.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To fulfil the Council's obligation to consult upon proposals and consider objections prior to decision.
2. To enable the scheme to be introduced as advertised if the objections are not upheld. The officers' view is that the proposal should be approved to improve the car parking facility for residents.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. Leave the current arrangements in place. Currently the off-street parking places are rented out to residents and each parking bay is protected by a locking post, and upright metal posts on both sides of the bay. The posts are unsightly and prone to accidental damage. The Housing Portfolio currently has funding to enhance the environment, which would include removing the metal posts. However, Housing Services do not have the resources to administer a parking scheme. It is considered that Parking Services, with a well-established capability for operating and enforcing permit schemes, is better placed to administer a parking scheme for the benefit of residents.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

4. A proposal to introduce a Residents' Parking scheme was brought forward by Housing Services under delegated powers in 2010, as part of a major regeneration of the Holyrood Estate. The proposed scheme would be a Residents' Parking scheme operated and administered by Parking Services, and would replace the existing arrangements run by Housing Services whereby individual spaces, protected by locking posts, are rented to residents, at a cost of £1.74 per week. The current system gives priority and lower rental costs to Council tenants, which is felt to be inequitable compared

to other owner / occupiers on the estate. It is also felt that residents of Holyrood Estate who require parking places for their cars should pay an appropriate amount for a city centre parking facility. A season ticket to park in the city centre is currently around £2K for a 7 day week ticket including a 20% discount. The proposal is to enhance the appearance of the car park by removing all the locking posts and bay separation posts, resurfacing and improving signing and marking. The number of parking spaces would remain the same at 178. Residents would be able to purchase an annual permit enabling them to park in the car park. The cost of the permit would be £150, discounted to £100 for those Council tenants who currently rent a parking space, in order to reduce the financial impact on them. Priority for permits would be given to those who currently rent a parking space, and there would be a limit of one permit per household, available to residents of Holyrood Estate and Palmerston House, Queensway (subject to the Council's existing policies on Residents' Parking schemes) on a first come, first served basis, regardless of whether or not the applicant is a Council tenant. Residents who currently rent two spaces would be given "grandfather rights" to two permits. Permit holders would not be able to reserve a particular space, but the number of permits available would not exceed the number of spaces, so permit holders should always be able to find a space. The scheme would be administered and enforced by Parking Services, whose enforcement team operate between the hours of 07.00 – 22.30 seven days a week.

5. A letter detailing the proposed scheme was sent by the local Housing Office to all residents who currently rent parking spaces in the off street car parking places on Holyrood Estate. This is over and above the normal consultation requirements for the introduction of residents' schemes and was considered appropriate in this case as these residents constituted an identifiable group currently using the facilities which the proposals affect. The proposed scheme was formally advertised in the Daily Echo and on street furniture in Holyrood Estate on 10 February 2012, with a closing date for receipt of objections of 2 March 2012. Details of the proposed scheme were also sent by Legal Services to the statutory consultees listed in Appendix 4, none of whom responded to the consultation.
6. In considering the impact of the proposals on disabled users, it was not considered necessary or appropriate to provide further disabled parking provision as part of the scheme as there is already an established process for providing parking places for Blue Badge Holders in Southampton. The legislation does not allow spaces on the highway to be allocated to named individuals. However, in the proposed Holyrood Scheme a resident who is also a Blue Badge holder would be able apply for a bay to be marked out for disabled users. Such a bay would require a vehicle to display a relevant parking permit as well as a Blue Badge. Otherwise, Blue badge holders may park in Pay and Display Parking bays in the city (including in the roads on Holyrood estate) free of charge and without time limit.

Objections

7. The proposed scheme attracted one objection from Mr Hamlet, a resident of Holyrood Estate. This objection was received on 16 February 2012. Mr Hamlet also presented a petition received on 29 February 2012 signed by nine other residents who object to the proposal, seven of whom currently rent a parking space.

8. Mr Hamlet has raised the following key points in his objection:
- He feels that the proposed scheme will have a negative impact on community safety.
 - He feels that cars parked on-street will be more vulnerable to opportunistic crime than off-street spaces.
 - He states that enforcement will not take place in the evenings and at night, which are the times it is most needed.
 - He states that a Freedom of Information request revealed Parking Services carried out 38 patrols and issued 3 penalty charge notices (PCNs).
 - The proposal does not deal with the times when there is no enforcement cover between 1900 and 0730 hours, when there would be a “free for all” for parking spaces, whether or not car users have permits.
 - There would also be cars belonging to visitors to the proposed Morrisons store, late night football matches, sales at Debenhams and the like.
 - Mr Hamlet asks what parking surveys the Council has carried out between the hours of 07.30 and 0730 hours, to consider what impact non-residents’ vehicles may have.
 - Parking at extra cost would have to be sought by residents who were displaced from permit holder bays by non-residents’ vehicles.
 - Mr Hamlet states that a Freedom of Information request has revealed that Hampshire Constabulary has recorded eighteen crimes over a three-month period on the Holyrood estate.
 - Mr Hamlet feels that parking should be arranged so that parked cars are overlooked by homes, to deter car crime.
 - He would prefer that, if the scheme is to go ahead, the locking posts are retained, to ensure he is able to park near his home at all times.

Officers’ response

- 9.
- Civil Enforcement Officers patrol up to 22.30 hours.
 - Any vehicle which does not display a permit would be issued with a PCN.
 - A similar Residents’ Parking Scheme in Kingsland was successfully implemented in 2010, and contraventions are fairly uncommon.
 - Patrols would be carried out at a level to ensure minimal contraventions.
 - Although the Council has not carried out any formal parking surveys on Holyrood estate, anecdotal evidence has been provided at meetings with residents in previous years. Residents’ concerns were mainly based around pavement parking in the evenings, and the obstruction caused by a few irresponsible drivers.
 - Although the individual parking spaces would not be reserved, the number of permits issued would not exceed the number of spaces.
 - There are ample parking spaces to accommodate all those who currently rent spaces; currently there are 41 spaces which have no tenant
 - The recorded crimes reported by Hampshire Constabulary in response to Mr Hamlet’s FOI request do not appear to include any vehicle-related crime.

- City Centre surface car parks, and on-street Pay and Display parking are free of charge after 6pm every day of the week and available for wider alternative public use.
- The unsightly steel posts currently in use are prone to accidental damage, and would detract from the appearance of the area, once the improvements are complete.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

10. The cost of progressing the TRO to introduce the scheme is estimated to be £4000. The physical works would be carried out as part of a £1 million improvement project on Holyrood Estate. The scheme would be funded by the Housing portfolio. The costs of the permits are set at a level to cover the costs of administering the permits and enforcing the scheme

Property/Other

11. N/A

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

12. 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:

13. 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. The impact of these proposals has been assessed as part of their introduction and consultation and key considerations identified as part of that process are set out in the main body of this report.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

14. The proposals in this report are consistent with the Local Transport Plan 2006-11 policy on promoting sustainable travel and the Strategic Parking Policy.

AUTHOR:	Name:	Barbara Thomas	Tel:	023 8079 8064
	E-mail:	Barbara.thomas@bblivingplaces.com		

KEY DECISION? No

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	Bargate
------------------------------------	---------

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

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

Appendices

1.	Letter of objection
2.	Location Plan
3.	Photographs of Kingsland Estate before and after introduction of Residents' Parking Scheme
4.	List of statutory consultees

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	None
----	------

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	Yes/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.	None	
----	------	--