

Meeting: Portfolio Holder Decision

Portfolio Area: Economy, Enterprise & Transport

Date: 24 July 2020

Consideration of consultation responses: proposed permit parking and related restrictions in the Old Town area of Stevenage.

Author – Philip Howard (Traffic & Parking Enforcement Manager)

Contact Officers – Philip Howard (extension 2296)

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1. To detail responses received to a statutory public consultation on proposed parking controls in various roads in Old Town Ward for consideration by the Portfolio Holder.
- 1.2. To enable the Portfolio Holder in consultation with Ward Councillors to decide if and how the Council will now proceed with these proposals.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. Representations should be invited on altering the proposed hours of operation to 9.30am to 3pm Monday to Friday as set out in paragraph 4.67 and lowering the costs of permits and visitor vouchers, as set out in Table 5.
- 2.2. Representations should be invited on allowing permits and visitor vouchers to addresses in Inns Close as Southend Close represents the nearest on-street parking, in a similar manner to the entitlement for residential properties in the High Street, as set out in paragraph 4.68.
- 2.3. A design should be prepared and representations should be invited on reducing the extent of the proposed parking place in Drapers Way as set out in paragraphs 4.54 to 4.56.
- 2.4. Subject to consideration of representations received, the scheme should be implemented with alterations as set out in paragraphs 4.54 to 4.56 and paragraphs 4.67 to 4.68 and Table 5, notwithstanding that a decision on implementing permit parking controls in Alleyns Road should be deferred as set out in paragraphs 4.52 to 4.53 and the disabled bay near no. 30 Stanmore Road should be removed from the traffic order as set out in paragraph 4.57.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1. Under an Agency Agreement with Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) (the Traffic Authority for the area) Stevenage Borough Council (SBC) is empowered to make Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for the control and restriction of parking, and enforce those restrictions through Civil Parking Enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 3.2. Over time, SBC has received extensive comments and concerns from residents about substantial commuter and non-resident parking, inconveniencing and obstructing residents. A survey of residents' views carried out in 2017 indicated an area where there was a high level of apparent demand for permit parking controls to limit parking to residents and their visitors, only.
- 3.3. Permit parking imposes limitations and controls on anyone wishing to park in the permit area during controlled hours, and has a cost implication for residents wanting to buy a parking permit or visitor vouchers. It can therefore only be introduced where there is a strong level of support from residents, and residents are willing to pay the necessary permit fees.
- 3.4. Residents were further surveyed in summer 2019, to confirm whether there was still demand for permit parking, if residents were willing to pay the necessary costs, what limitations they would want on permits, and if they would support the use of digital-only virtual permits.
- 3.5. In the area that had favoured permits in 2017, roughly three quarters of survey replies indicated that they would support their introduction and that they would be willing to pay the necessary cost. Approximately half of addresses replied, a sample size large enough to be considered likely to be representative.
- 3.6. Most responses supported the use of virtual permits, and residents also indicated on what days and at what times they would like permit parking controls to apply.
- 3.7. The findings of this survey were shared with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Councillors in September 2019. Having considered the findings, Cllrs directed that proposals for a scheme should be prepared based on them, and that Alleyns Road should be added to the proposed area as the survey showed high levels of support for permits in the street.
- 3.8. Throughout this process, Council officers carried out site observations which substantiated that there was parking pressure in this area during the day. Pressure appeared to be greater in the southern streets of the area, and at the ends of streets closer to the high street. Parking pressure was seen to be lower at night and on Sundays, with some reversal of the pattern of parking distribution.
- 3.9. The scheme that was designed consisted of:
 - A "permit parking" restriction from 8.30am to 5.30pm in Albert Street, Alleyns Road, Basils Road, Grove Road, Southend Close, Stanmore Road, Victoria Close, and part of Church Lane and Walkern Road, with disabled bays in these streets being made legally enforceable;

- making parking bays in Church Lane “shared use”, keeping the time limit of 3 hours but giving an exception for residents and their visitors, and adding new shared use parking bays with the same rules in Church Lane, Drapers Way, Primett Road and Walkern Road;
 - creating limited waiting parking bays with a three hour limit and no exception for permit holders near the shops in Albert Street, near to the funeral directors in Letchmore Road, outside the surgery in Stanmore Road, and in the Sish Lane lay-by outside the church; and
 - placing yellow lines where needed between newly created parking bays, and in place of existing KEEP CLEAR markings along Church Lane, and on some junctions/bends.
- 3.10. Properties in the streets with permit parking would be able to buy parking permits and visitor vouchers, which would also be available to residents of (but not businesses in) Baker Street, Bells Lane, Church Lane, Drapers Way, High Street (between James Way and Letchmore Road, excepting Howarde Court, Ireton Court and Townsend Mews), Middle Row and Primett Road
- 3.11. After consultation with the Police and HCC, neither of which raised any concerns, authorisation was given by Tom Pike, (Strategic Director) for the advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order and Parking Places Orders necessary to put the scheme in place for public consultation in accordance with The Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 3.12. These formal proposals for statutory public consultation were advertised through a Notice of Proposals that was published in the Stevenage edition of The Comet on 16 January 2020. Copies of this notice were also erected on local street furniture, and notification letters were sent to addresses in the vicinity of the proposals and to statutory consultees. The consultation continued until 14 February 20.
- 3.13. Deposited documents including the Notice of Proposals and a Statement of Reasons for proposing to make this Order, together with copies of the draft Order and maps showing the locations and effects of the Order, were made available for the public to inspect at the Council’s offices in Daneshill House and via its website.
- 3.14. The consultation having been completed, it is now necessary for a decision to be made on if and how the Council should proceed with the introduction of and changes to parking restrictions that have been proposed.

4. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION AND OTHER OPTIONS

Synopsis of consultation

- 4.1. A total of 240 written responses were received about the proposed parking restrictions during the public consultation stage. Copies of the responses are included in Appendix One: Public Consultation Responses.

- 4.2. The proposals were clearly supported by 25 responses, while 155 objected. There were 16 replies that were partly in favour and partly objected, while 38 neither supported nor objected, but made comments or asked questions. One response confirmed the Police's previously stated position in relation to the proposals, that they have no objection.
- 4.3. The remaining "responses" were invalid. This could be because they were requesting parking controls in other areas rather than responding to the proposals being consulted on, or as not enough information was provided for them to be considered. For instance one online response form had been completed as a stated objection with the letters "asd" in every field so there was no identifiable correspondent or grounds of objection.
- 4.4. Broad themes in consultation responses included:
- Concern about the cost of permits and visitor vouchers, and the potential impact of this on residents on lower incomes and/or who are dependent on numerous visitors for instance for child care.
 - Concern about the impact of restrictions on the drop-off and collection of children from Letchmore Infants and Nursery School, including possible road safety impacts for children.
 - Concern about parking relating to the surgery in Stanmore Road, there being suggestions that too much or too little provision has been made by placing limited waiting bays outside.
 - Concern about potential parking displacement causing issues in surrounding streets.
 - A strong desire from residents in the street for Alleyns Road to be omitted from the initial implementation of the scheme, with a further survey of their views taking place following a settling in period to see if the controls should be implemented there also.
- 4.5. These concerns were discussed with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Councillors at an informal meeting to update them on what consultation responses had been received. Possible options for how to progress the project were mooted, including changes to the physical area or to the timings of restrictions.
- 4.6. The feeling of Ward Councillors was that: considering previous survey results showing strong support for progressing a permit scheme along the lines proposed, the purposes for which proposals had been made, and the relative affordability of permits compared to vehicle running costs; but acknowledging the potentially onerous impact of visitor voucher costs; their preference would be to progress the proposals unchanged but offering visitor vouchers at a reduced cost. Those preferences have been borne in mind in preparing this report.
- 4.7. Councillors were subsequently provided via email with the complete text of every responses to allow them to fully consider them all.

Consultation responses

4.8. Detailed comments on individual responses are provided in Appendix One: Public Consultation Responses.

4.9. The main themes in responses were as outlined in paragraph 4.4 above.

Affordability

4.10. As permit costs were proposed to cover the costs of the scheme, not to make a profit, there is limited scope for lowering the proposed fees to improve affordability for residents without making the scheme unaffordable for the Council. If the permit area were to be implemented but not be self-funding, its operation would have to be paid for from general funds, thereby imposing a burden of cost on all residents throughout the town regardless of whether they benefit from it or even own a car.

4.11. Making permits more affordable for residents would also reduce the effectiveness of the permit parking control as a measure to deter excess car ownership and reduce car use, weakening these benefits of the scheme.

4.12. Consideration must be given the question of social equitability that some responses raised. While any measures imposing financial costs to effect change are inevitably in some degree regressive, it is likely that those most liable to be affected will already be one car households. The proposed cost of a “first vehicle in household” permit is comparable to that of replacing a tyre or purchasing a full tank of fuel, both common requirements of car ownership, and significantly less than the cost of purchasing and insuring a vehicle. It therefore does not appear an unreasonable price to require in order to allow the provision of the permits that a majority residents indicated they wanted when surveyed.

4.13. The potential impact of visitor voucher costs may be more significant, with some residents reporting the need for at least one visitor per day and citing concerns about social isolation effects or difficulty with child care arrangements. Visitor voucher costs of £1 per vehicle per day have the potential to cost a resident several hundred pounds a year while they may personally have no vehicle and have only a low/fixed income.

4.14. This could be alleviated by allowing the reuse of physical visitor vouchers on multiple vehicles on a single day, and by offering lower voucher costs. Such changes were favoured by Ward Councillors when discussing this. Such price reductions would still have an effect on the financial viability of the proposed permit area.

4.15. The cost impact of visitor vouchers could also be reduced by shortening the area’s times of operation, which would help residents to not need to use them.

School and nursery parking

4.16. Limited allowance had been made for school and nursery parking in the proposed scheme design. At the earlier stage there had been a low level of response in relation to this, and while the requested mitigations were considered they were not consistent with residents’ expressed wishes or were not practicable

(such as allowing two hours waiting for any vehicle throughout the area). Councillors did not favour taking an approach contrary to the views of the majority of survey responses or that would make the permit area impractical.

4.17. However, numerous formal consultation responses raised concerns about the impact of introducing permits in the immediate vicinity of the Letchmore Infants and Nursery School. These particularly highlighted:

- the number of pupils in the school and resultant level of travel demand;
- the proportion of pupils living at a distance who have been allocated a place at the school regardless of this, for whom non-car options are less practical;
- concerns that there could be road safety impacts due to parking displacement and increased parking pressure in nearby streets.

4.18. Some of these responses appeared spurious, such as complaints from parents living within a very short walk of the school about the difficulty it would create for them to park.

4.19. It is clear from responses from the school, from parents, and from residents of the closest streets, that significant numbers of children do arrive by car, and that it may be less viable for them to travel by different modes of transport. This relates to both the age of the children concerned, and the origin and destination of their parents journeys, whether travelling from as far away as Hitchin or because of a need to go on to work at a remote location.

4.20. While such responses are to be expected to a degree, it is difficult for them to be fully considered without clearer details of the level of demand, peak parking pattern, and origin/destination of all trips. As a minimum, additional observations would need to be made at the start/end of the school day to help quantify behaviours, and this would need to be carried out at a time when Covid-19 restrictions are not in place.

4.21. This would also assist with consideration of the effects of school parking displacement and any road safety impacts. On cursory inspection streets to the east of Letchmore Road are no less suitable for necessary drop-offs, if perhaps mildly less convenient than Albert Street and Stanmore Road, but this needs to be viewed in the context of the existing level of use.

4.22. It would be hoped that higher intensity parking in other streets could serve to deter excess demand from parents who could travel by other modes.

4.23. More intense parking and greater numbers of carriageway crossings to access the school has the potential to increase the likelihood of collisions and injuries, reducing highway safety.

4.24. At the same time, an increased level of hazard perception can lead to greater caution among road users, and result in improved highway safety.

- 4.25. Overall it appears likely that the impacts of the proposed restrictions if in force at school start/end times would be complex and unpredictable.
- 4.26. If the restrictions were proposed to go ahead unchanged and therefore impact on school drop-off and collection trips, a suitable safety audit approach should be taken combined with discussions with the County Council's Active and Safer Travel Team who deal with school travel planning, to inform whether this is the correct approach and determine any supporting mitigation measures that may be required.
- 4.27. Similar concerns were expressed in relation to the two nurseries near to the school, where it was also reported that the timings of comings and goings were less regular as some children attend for part rather than whole days, and start/end times are staggered. At the same time, it is likely that changes benefitting school parking would be of some help to necessary nursery parking also.
- 4.28. While this would not render the same level of assistance, the same level of concern was not expressed about the impact of proposed restrictions on nursery parking as school parking. Simultaneously a number of residents suggested that nursery parking was problematic, so an approach that offers a reduced but not removed impact on nursery parking could be considered balanced. It is also likely that some nursery parking drop off/pick up during controlled hours would be facilitated by the proposed limited waiting parking bays outside the surgery.

Surgery parking

- 4.29. Provision relating to the Stanmore Medical Centre was a matter of contention, with a number of responses from both residents and patients as well as the surgery itself.
- 4.30. The proposal is to provide limited waiting parking bays alongside the side wall of the practice, not directly fronting any residential properties. These would accommodate approximately six vehicles.
- 4.31. The surgery possesses a car park to the rear capable of accommodating approximately 22 vehicles. It is also believed that the Surgery proposes to create additional parking for up to four vehicles on its own land near to its front entrance,
- 4.32. Some residents felt that the proposed on-street limited waiting provision near the surgery was excessive, and that residents would be excluded from using this space.
- 4.33. Other responses were concerned that parking provision would be insufficient for patients' needs, and suggested that at present patient parking takes place throughout the street without causing particular issues and that space is generally available.
- 4.34. Considering these viewpoints and officers' observations, it is deemed that the proposed parking bays would ensure that available space for short-stay parking is concentrated near to the surgery without significantly impinging on residents' ability to park. It is not considered likely that patients would struggle due to competition

from shoppers, who it is expected would park in other locations closer to the high street.

- 4.35. The surgery advised that fifty or more patients visit each hour.
- 4.36. Assuming an average ten minute appointment length and an additional 200% headway for checking in and waiting time each patient would require parking for approximately 30 minutes.
- 4.37. If all patients attended by car (which is unlikely), the existing off-street parking and proposed on-street bays would therefore suffice for the needs of approximately 56 patients. Should the development of additional parking spaces on surgery land go ahead as is expected, this would create additional capacity as would each patient who attends the surgery by other modes of transport.
- 4.38. The surgery reports that at present all of its staff drive to work. Given the health impacts of commuting by car, and that according to the most recently available National Travel Survey only 62% of commutes are made by car, this is disappointing.
- 4.39. This said, it does not appear unreasonable to expect that the Surgery should make its off-street parking available for those patients who need to attend by car, and reduce the extent to which it is used by staff. Although it is believed that the surgery car park is primarily used for staff parking at present, the surgery's comment that permit controls "would make parking for them also extremely difficult" implies an expectation of at least some of this space being made available to patients.
- 4.40. While workplace travel planning is a matter for the employer, it is noted that it is only a short distance from here to the Church Lane car parks where staff could leave their cars if they are unable or unwilling to travel by other modes, while the surgery should as a public health body be encouraging them to do so for both their own and others' benefit.
- 4.41. Should the surgery be unable or unwilling to entirely release its car park for patient use, additional parking that could be used by patients would be available in limited waiting bays in Church Lane, and the Church Lane North car park as some consultation responses highlighted. This includes newly-proposed limited waiting bays that would remove all-day parking by commuters giving new opportunity for short-stay parking.
- 4.42. Disabled patients who are unable to walk from Church Lane/Walkern Road would be able to park in the Permit Parking Area using their Blue Badge, so would be able to access the surgery as at present and with competition only from permit holders rather than from commuters as well.
- 4.43. It appears overall that there would be an appropriate level of parking provision in the vicinity of the surgery for its patients, without an undue impact on residents.
- 4.44. No changes to the proposals near the surgery are therefore recommended.

Parking displacement and other streets

- 4.45. Parking displacement into other streets is frequently found when permit parking areas are introduced, and concerns about this were commonly expressed in consultation responses.
- 4.46. Residents in streets surrounding the proposed permit area were included in the survey conducted last year, and this probability was drawn to their attention.
- 4.47. Survey responses from these streets showed little support for pre-emptive action. Given the need for high levels of support from residents for permit controls to be introduced, this did not reach a level that would make the inclusion of surrounding streets in permit parking proposals viable.
- 4.48. If the proposed permit area is implemented, levels of concern in nearby streets will be monitored, particularly where residents have raised this issue in response to the consultation such as Letchmore Road and Haycroft Road.
- 4.49. Observations will also be made to assess the level of parking pressure in these locations.
- 4.50. Should there be sufficient levels of concern and parking pressure, residents may then be surveyed to determine whether a further project should be commenced to investigate expanding the permit area, or pursuing other parking controls, to address issues resulting from parking displacement.

Alleyns Road

- 4.51. Following previous surveys it was the view of officers that the case for making proposals in Alleyns Road was unproven although there was a high level of stated support from resident. Given the level of residential support, it was the view of Councillors that the street should be proposed for inclusion in the permit parking controls.
- 4.52. Whereas residents in Alleyns Road had overall favoured permit controls when surveyed previously, fearing likely parking displacement a significant majority of consultation responses in the street (23 of 26) asked that the introduction of permits here not take place at the same time as the rest of the proposed area. Rather, they would prefer to be resurveyed after implementation of controls in other streets, and have the control added in Alleyns Road only if they experience difficulties and residents are then in favour.
- 4.53. The regulations allow that a decision be deferred, so it is possible to acquiesce to this request, which appears a reasonable and proportionate course of action.

Other issues

- 4.54. It had been proposed to create parking bays along the north side of Drapers Way. However, one consultation response drew attention to loading activity that takes place on the southside. This was also witnessed by officers when erecting

street notices, although it had not been observed during earlier stages of the process.

- 4.55. The vehicles loading would be unable to service businesses from another location, and parking opposite them would create an obstruction.
- 4.56. It is therefore recommended that the proposed parking place in Drapers Way is reduced in length to avoid this probability, subject to affording the opportunity for those affected by this change to make representations in relation to it.
- 4.57. It has also been identified that one of the disabled bays proposed to be legalised (in Stanmore Road) is no longer needed, and it is recommended that it is therefore removed from the proposals.
- 4.58. A number of responses asked for additional restrictions to be implemented or highlighted areas where they believe there is a parking problem.
- 4.59. Implementing further restrictions would mean going through the full TRO process to understand and evidence the need for them, take on board public comments, gain Police and County Council approval, and formally consult. Doing so within this project would be liable to delay its progression and would not represent the best use of limited resources.
- 4.60. The Grange has been the subject of a number of requests and it is intended that a separate project will be progressed to address hazardous/obstructive parking that takes place here.
- 4.61. Other locations where there are concerns about existing parking behaviour or about possible displacement parking issues causing a hazard or obstruction will be monitored and the proposal of restrictions to address these concerns considered following completion of this project, including Haycroft Road and Letchmore Road.

Possible courses of action

- 4.62. The regulations allow a decision on the inclusion of Alleyns Road to be deferred, and it is therefore possible to acquiesce to residents requests to postpone the possible implementation of permits here behind other streets provided that the decision was made and implemented within two years of the date of first advertising the formal proposals.
- 4.63. As indicated in paragraph 4.5 above, the general preference of Ward Councillors was to retain the proposals otherwise unchanged in terms of layout. They also preferred not to alter the timing of restrictions, but to offer permits and visitor vouchers at a lower cost.
- 4.64. The charges for parking permits and visitor vouchers had been calculated in such a manner that the proposed permit area would be anticipated to break even, with the possibility of there being a small surplus that could support transport and environmental maintenance and improvements in the area, or future proof the scheme against future cost increases. Lowering these charges would mean that the area would not be anticipated to break even.

4.65. One suggestion from Ward Councillors was that the cost of visitor vouchers should be halved. However, without making any other changes to the proposals this would lead to a likely deficit in the operation of the permit area of approximately 10% to begin with and increasing over time as enforcement contract costs rise with inflation, ultimately costing the Council a probable £15,000 in the first five years of operation. In fairness to residents in the existing permit area in Burymead, the visitor voucher costs in that area would also have to be reduced, meaning the area that currently breaks even would move to a loss of some £500 a year.

Table 1: Old Town income and expenditure with lower visitor voucher costs (£10 for 20), without other changes (8.30am-5.30pm Mon-Sat).			
	Physical Permit Cost	Virtual Permit Cost	Anticipated revenue
Resident Parking Permit for first vehicle at the address	£ 60	£ 56	£8,236
Resident Parking Permit for second vehicle at the address	£ 86	£ 82	£4,368
Resident Parking Permit for third vehicle at the address	£120	£115	£1,292
Set of 20 Resident's Visitor Parking Vouchers	£ 10		£4,510
	Anticipated annual revenue		£18,406
	Total anticipated cost year one		-£20,366
	Anticipated net position year one		-£1,960
	Anticipated five year revenue		£92,033
	Total anticipated five year cost		-£107,051
	Anticipated five year net position		-£15,018

4.66. Shortening the hours of operation to 9.30am to 3pm, thereby assuaging some concerns around school access and reducing the need to purchase visitor vouchers by facilitating afternoon guests out of controlled hours, and amending the cost of permits to acknowledge the reduction in enforcement hours as well as reducing the cost of visitor vouchers, would allow this loss to be reduced by around half.

Table 2: Old Town income and expenditure with lower visitor voucher costs (£10 for 20) and shorter hours of operation (9.30am-3pm Mon-Sat).

	Physical Permit Cost	Virtual Permit Cost	Anticipated revenue
Resident Parking Permit for first vehicle at the address	£ 48	£ 42	£6,390
Resident Parking Permit for second vehicle at the address	£ 74	£ 69	£3,692
Resident Parking Permit for third vehicle at the address	£100	£ 95	£1,067
Set of 20 Resident's Visitor Parking Vouchers	£ 10		£4,510
	Anticipated annual revenue		£15,659
	Total anticipated cost year one		-£16,717
	Anticipated net position year one		-£651
	Anticipated five year revenue		£78,295
	Total anticipated five year cost		-£85,729
	Anticipated five year net position		-£7,434

4.67. Retaining those shortened hours and reducing the days of operation to Monday to Friday only would allow the permit area to be self-financing with a slight further reduction in permit costs, with a small surplus expected over the first two years of operation but falling into deficit thereafter.

Table 3: Old Town income and expenditure with lower visitor voucher costs (£10 for 20) and shorter hours and days of operation (9.30am-3pm Mon-Fri).

	Physical Permit Cost	Virtual Permit Cost	Anticipated revenue
Resident Parking Permit for first vehicle at the address	£45	£40	£6,035
Resident Parking Permit for second vehicle at the address	£71	£66	£3,562
Resident Parking Permit for third vehicle at the address	£97	£92	£1,040
Set of 20 Resident's Visitor Parking Vouchers	£ 10		£4,510
	Anticipated annual revenue		£15,147
	Total anticipated cost year one		-£14,547
	Anticipated net position year one		£599
	Anticipated five year revenue		£75,733
	Total anticipated five year cost		-£76,466
	Anticipated five year net position		-£733

4.68. Allowing residents in Inns Close to obtain permits and visitor vouchers as requested by response 172.0 would both ensure fairness and provide a small increase in revenue to help support the costs of providing the scheme, perhaps in the region of £200 a year based on known need for permits and likely visitor voucher uptake. Over a five year period this would see the permit area as a whole likely to break even, though the deficit from price matching in Burymead would remain unresolved.

4.69. While virtual visitor vouchers can only function by allocating a vehicle registration to the voucher, if physical vouchers were to be made "vehicle free" as some residents requested this would allow their use by multiple visitors on one day meaning residents would receive greater utility from them than from virtual vouchers. At the same time, issuing paper visitor vouchers imposes a higher cost on the council both in administration to prepare them and post them out, and in purchasing the controlled stationary: the physical scratch cards for a set of 20 vouchers costs SBC £5. It could therefore be considered justifiable to lower the cost of twenty paper visitor vouchers by a smaller amount, to £15, while reducing the cost for twenty virtual vouchers further to £10 reflecting the lower cost to SBC. If this approach were taken, and if half of visitor vouchers taken up were physical

vouchers, this would increase visitor voucher income sufficiently to cover the income lost in Burymead.

Table 4: Overall permit parking financial position including Burymead with £15 paper visitor vouchers and £10 virtual visitor vouchers.			
	Burymead (8.30am-5.30pm Mon-Sat)	Old Town (9.30am-3pm Mon-Fri)	Total
Anticipated annual revenue	£3,890	£16,492	£20,382
Anticipated annual costs	-£4,150	-£14,547	-£18,697
Anticipated net position year one	-£ 250	£1,944	£ 1,694
Anticipated five year revenue	£19,450	£82,458	£101,908
Total anticipated five year cost	-£21,428	-£75,733	-£97,161
Anticipated five year net position	-£ 1,978	£5,992	£4,014

4.70. Finally, reflecting concerns about the cost of annual permits councillors should consider whether shorter duration permits should be offered. Given the relatively low fees if proposed alterations are made, it is considered likely that six month permits would suffice. The administrative costs of issuing a six month permit being equal to that of issuing an annual permit, it is suggested that the cost should therefore be slightly more than 50% of the annual permit to ensure the full cost of administration is covered. The following final scale of charges would ensue from such an approach.

Table 5: Recommended permit prices for all permit parking areas.				
	Burymead		Old Town	
	Physical Permit Cost	Virtual Permit Cost	Physical Permit Cost	Virtual Permit Cost
Resident Parking Permit for first vehicle at the address (annual/six month)	£56/£34	£52/£30	£45/£28	£40/£24
Resident Parking Permit for second vehicle at the address (annual/six month)	£82/£47	£78/£43	£71/£41	£66/£37
Resident Parking Permit for third vehicle at the address (annual/six month)	£108/£60	£104/£56	£97/£53	£92/£49
Resident Parking Permit for fourth vehicle at the address (annual/six month)	£134/£73	£130/£69	Not allowed	
Set of 20 Resident's Visitor Parking Vouchers	£15	£10	£15	£10

4.71. To make these changes to the scheme, it would be necessary to allow those likely to be affected by the changes the opportunity to make representations in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

4.72. If it is decided to proceed as recommended, it had been anticipated that the scheme could be implemented before the end of the current financial year, depending on the timing of the decision, of allowing residents the opportunity to make representations, and the relaxation of restrictions on business and movement due to Covid-19. Given budgetary constraints as noted in paragraph 5.1 however it is now likely that implementation would only be possible in the next financial year.

Recommendations

4.73. Representations should be invited on altering the proposed hours of operation to 9.30am to 3pm Monday to Friday as set out in paragraph 4.67 and lowering the costs of permits and visitor vouchers, as set out in Table 5.

4.74. Representations should be invited on allowing permits and visitor vouchers to addresses in Inns Close as Southend Close represents the nearest on-street parking, in a similar manner to the entitlement for residential properties in the High Street, as set out in paragraph 4.68.

- 4.75. A design should be prepared and representations should be invited on reducing the extent of the proposed parking place in Drapers Way as set out in paragraphs 4.54 to 4.56.
- 4.76. Subject to consideration of representations received, the scheme should be implemented with alterations as set out in paragraphs 4.54 to 4.56 and paragraphs 4.67 to 4.68 and Table 5, notwithstanding that a decision on implementing permit parking controls in Alleyns Road should be deferred as set out in paragraphs 4.52 to 4.53 and the disabled bay near no. 30 Stanmore Road should be removed from the traffic order as set out in paragraph 4.57.

Other options

- 4.77. If it is decided not to proceed as recommended, the alternatives are:
- To implement the original proposals unaltered. This is not recommended as it would not address residents' and others' legitimate concerns about the costs of permits and visitor vouchers and the timing and potential impact of restrictions.
 - To implement the proposals with permit/visitor voucher costs lowered but without other alteration. This is not recommended, as it would mean that the permit area would not be self-funding and it would therefore be unsustainable.
 - To decide not to progress the proposals, and end the entire project. This is not recommended as it would not address the problems that the proposals have been put forward to deal with.
 - To decide to implement only some of the proposals. This is not recommended as it would not address the problems that the proposals have been put forward to deal with.
 - To prepare and consult on proposals for additional, different or significantly altered restrictions. This is not recommended as there is little justification for doing so. It would unduly delay the completion of the project and would not represent good use of resources.

5. IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications

- 5.1. If it is decided to proceed as recommended a capital budget is available for the implementation of the scheme, however this has been placed on hold due to the Cpvld-19 crisis and is not expected to be released until the next financial year. The operation of the permit area is expected to be self-funding once in place.
- 5.2. If it were decided to pursue lower permit costs without reducing the hours of operation, the permit area would not be self funding. This would be contrary to the

cost-neutral expectation on the basis of which the Council's Executive Committee confirmed that the decision to proceed with a permit area or not should sit with the Portfolio Holder in consultation with Ward Councillors. It is therefore likely that such a decision would need to be ratified by the Council's Executive Committee due to its ongoing financial implications.

5.3. If it is decided not to proceed, a capital saving would be made.

Legal Implications

5.4. None identified.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

5.5. An Equality Impact Assessment of the introduction of permit parking areas has been carried out. It identified that the unit's responsibilities and methods would not discriminate against people on grounds of age; disability; gender; ethnicity; sexual orientation; religion/belief; or by way of financial exclusion.

Service Delivery Implications

5.6. The addition of new parking restrictions will place further demand on limited parking enforcement and administrative resources, increasing the likely need to expand the service in future.

5.7. The creation of a Permit Parking Area in these streets is likely to have a displacement effect, leading to increased concerns about parking in the neighbouring area and calls for additional parking controls nearby, which would need to be serviced.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

5.8. 2016 and 2019 survey letters and results.

5.9. Deposit documents for formal public consultation

5.10. Template letter from formal public consultation

5.11. 2017 Executive Committee report and decision on Permit Parking