

Amendments to draft paper on CPZs.

(GW, 7 April 2014)

1) Changed title:

**Controlled Parking Zones in residential areas (CPZs).**

A Draft Policy

(Cllr George Wheeler V2 April 2014)

2) Changed third paragraph of summary:

A four-stage procedure is put forward. The first stage is the identification of a proposed CPZ boundary and the preferred controlled parking regime by the ward councillors working with their constituents. **Criteria are set out for establishment of a CPZ. If the requirements do not suit these criteria, another solution should be sought.**

3) Changed section 2.2:

2.2) Since the object is one of avoiding local inconvenience, it is suggested that the formulation of the solution is best done locally, by the ward councillors and their affected residents. Ward councillors will be made aware of problem parking areas by their constituents who have difficulty in parking. Drivers who have difficulty in parking near their homes are not likely to be reticent in telling their councillors about it. Discussion between the ward councillors and residents needs to identify the boundary of the CPZ and the level of restriction to be imposed. Appropriate advice would be taken from professional transport staff but a recommendation to the cabinet member will be put forward by the ward councillors. The recommendation will address the boundary of the CPZ and the level of restriction to be imposed.

**Criteria are offered for the establishment of new residential CPZs. (Section 5). The object must be to restrict on-street parking by a lower-priority classification of user to make on-street parking more available for higher-priority classifications. If the problem is one of blocked driveways or garage entrances or other obstructions, the solution should be based on white bar markings, limited waiting or other TROs, not through a CPZ.**

Before taking this process too far, it would be wise to ascertain from the cabinet member whether the scheme is likely to proceed. Otherwise, the hopes of the community could be raised only to go unfulfilled.

**The expenditure that is needed during this process e.g. for any costs of meetings or publicity, must be sourced locally,** from Living Streets fund, community grant or other funding source available to ward councillors. At the end of this stage there will have been no formal consultation over a proposal but the ward councillors should be reasonably confident of the proposal receiving majority support if it is subject to formal consultation.

Past investigations have sometimes been accompanied by **on-street surveys of usage of the available parking spaces**. It is the experience of the author that these surveys have achieved little beyond confirmation of the residents' identification of the problem. They have resource implications and if a survey is to be undertaken, it's funding needs to be identified. **Surveys of the likely number of permit applications and parking availability are likely to be needed.**

4) Changed section 2.5: add at end

**subject to the availability of resources.**

5) New section 5, renumber old section 5 as 6.

**5) Criteria for the establishment of residential CPZs.**

**(See Gill Peele's paper on potential criteria)**

**6) Too many different schemes.**