

## PLYMOUTH CITY COUNCIL

**Subject:** Controlled Parking Zones: On Street Parking Review  
**Committee:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 1 July 2014  
**Cabinet Member:** Councillor Coker  
**CMT Member:** Anthony Payne (Strategic Director for Place)  
**Author:** Mike Artherton (Parking and Marine Manager)  
**Contact details** Tel: 01752 305582  
Email: mike.artherton@plymouth.gov.uk  
**Ref:** CPZ1714  
**Key Decision:** Yes  
**Part:** 1

---

### **Purpose of the report:**

This report seeks Cabinet approval to recommendations for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) policy, recommendations to define when the introduction a CPZ is an appropriate tool to assist in tackling difficulties with residents parking. The recommendations set out a cooperative and democratic approach to the consultation and adoption of such schemes.

---

### **The Brilliant Co-operative Council Corporate Plan 2013/14 -2016/17:**

#### Pioneering Plymouth

“We will be responsible for designing and delivering better services that are more accountable, flexible and efficient in spite of reducing resources”.

The recommendations contained with this report will enable the designing and deliver of better services for residents of Plymouth.

#### Caring Plymouth

“We will promote a fairer, more equal city by investing in communities, putting citizens at the heart of decision making, promoting independence and reducing health and inequality”.

The recommendations in this report put forward a cooperative framework whereby residents are at the heart of determining whether, and what, residents parking schemes may be introduced to improve their quality of life.

---

**Implications for Medium Term Financial Plan and Resource Implications:  
Including finance, human, IT and land**

There are no direct financial implications with the production and adoption of the policy. Once operational, there may be financial implications associated with the implementation of the policy for individual consultation exercises and potential schemes on a case by case basis. Schemes will be subject to separate report as they arise with the principle that the potential cost of individual consultations and proposals will be met from the relevant ward Councillors "Living Street" budget and any costs of implementation of actual schemes will be met from applying reasonable fees and charges.

**Other Implications: e.g. Child Poverty, Community Safety, Health and Safety and Risk Management:**

None

**Equality and Diversity**

Has an Equality Impact Assessment been undertaken? Yes

**Recommendations and Reasons for recommended action:**

To approve the recommendations from the Cooperative Scrutiny Board, together with officer recommendations, for the adoption of a Controlled Parking Zone policy. The policy sets defines the criteria for when a Controlled Parking Zone is an appropriate tool to help resolve parking difficulties within residential areas.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

Not adopting this policy is rejected as this would not see the Council establish defined criteria to enable a clear and consistent approach to addressing many parking difficulties within residential areas of Plymouth, areas which experience difficulties due to high demands for parking impacting on residents quality of life.

**Published work / information:**

None

**Background papers:**

Title	Part I	Part II	Exemption Paragraph Number							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Equality Impact Assessment	√									

**Sign off:**

Fin	PlaceF TC1415 004- SRA-03-07- 2014	Leg	DVS/ 20660	Mon Off	DVS/ 20660	HR		Assets		IT		Strat Proc	
Originating SMT Member: Simon Dale													
Has the Cabinet Member(s) agreed the contents of the report? Yes													

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1. This report puts forward recommendations for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) policy to define when the introduction of a CPZ is an appropriate tool to assist in tackling difficulties with residents parking. The recommendations set out a cooperative and democratic approach to the consultation and adoption of such schemes.
- 1.2. This report details the recommendations from the Cooperative Scrutiny Board together with officer response and subsequent recommendations in the adoption of such a Controlled Parking Zone policy.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1. In September 2010 work began on a review of on street parking in Plymouth, the review was in response to increasing demands on on-street parking. Residents and business were consulted on what they thought works well, what doesn't work well and where opportunity existed to improve on street parking.
- 2.2. Following the review a number of proposals were implemented to support residents and businesses. This included: -
  - Increasing residents parking by allowing residents to park within some underutilised pay and display bays
  - Support for local businesses through the introduction of a new business parking permit, a permit providing greater flexibility to meet local businesses needs
  - Support for local businesses through introducing new technology to ensure the turnover of vehicles in short stay parking bays, short stay high turnover bays essential to the success local businesses.
- 2.3. Work then commenced focused specifically on residential parking and in particular Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's). The Working Plymouth Scrutiny Panel undertook a review into CPZ's. The principal objective of the review was to establish the criteria/principals for when a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) may be considered, to define the parking difficulties/situations to which a CPZ may be an appropriate solution.

## **3. CURRENT POSITION**

- 3.1. The Working Plymouth Cooperative Review Scrutiny Group commenced on 16<sup>th</sup> December 13 and concluded on 17<sup>th</sup> April 14. Recommendations were presented to the Cooperative Scrutiny Board on 25<sup>th</sup> June 14.
- 3.2. In undertaking the review the Scrutiny Group considered evidence submitted by Councillors, MP's and Neighbourhood Liaison Officers whilst hearing evidence from the University of Plymouth, Transport, Planning, Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Plymouth Community Healthcare.

## 4. CO-OPERATIVE SCRUTINY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1. Below are the recommendations from the Co-operative Scrutiny Board together with officers response: -

### **Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation A: -**

- 4.2. A resident's controlled parking zone must improve the quality of life, for residents of an identified area, where non-resident parking prevents residents from accessing reasonable on street parking relatively close their homes. A resident's controlled parking zone should only be considered after a significant number of evidence based on-street parking issues have been raised with Ward Councillors by residents. A controlled parking zone may not always be considered as the solution; especially if the issues raised by residents are not considered to be about solving parking.

### **Officer Comment: -**

- 4.3. This recommendation is agreed however it is recommended to better define the amount of 'non-residential' parking within a defined area before considering a CPZ.
- 4.4. It is recommended that a CPZ should only be considered whereby 20%, or more, of the available residents parking, within a defined area and on a regular basis, is occupied by non-residential parking. The impact of the non-residential parking should be a consistent difficulty in parking for local residents.
- 4.5. It is also important to recognise that, parking being a highly emotive subject, it is important to base such decisions on factual information.

### **Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation B: -**

- 4.6. The initial options for design, and the boundary, should be worked up by Ward Councillors together with local residents and businesses. When working through the options, Ward Councillors must consider street(s) affected, neighbouring streets, adjacent area(s), causes and possible remedies including appropriate time restrictions. Technical advice may be sought from officers to support initial outline design concepts. Ward councillors may consider opportunities for the rationalisation of existing resident controlled parking zones, and the creation of larger zones, or possibly merging existing zones, in order to address local residents' needs. When designing a scheme the impact on the needs of a wider group must be considered such as visiting friends and relatives, professional trades' people, business parking for customers and staff and general visitors.

### **Officer Comment: -**

- 4.7. This recommendation is agreed. As with recommendation A, such decisions should be made on factual information.

### **Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation C: -**

- 4.8. The initial consultation with residents will be informal and undertaken by Ward Councillors. In doing this the Ward Councillors will use their Living Streets budgets to pay for incidental expenses. Where the cause or proposed remedy(s) will impact on residents of more than one ward, Ward Councillors will work together to seek to identify the optimum trans-boundary scheme for all residents.

#### **Officer Comment: -**

- 4.9. This recommendation is agreed. Ward Councillors can consult with local communities on parking issues; recognising these criteria to determine the suitability of a CPZ, developing and consulting on proposals which best meet the needs of the local community.

### **Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation D: -**

- 4.10. The informal consultation will promote engagement and return of votes from as many residents as possible. A proposed scheme will not progress to the next stage, formal consultation, if the majority do not express their approval. A low turnout/low number of votes overall may indicate insignificant support for such scheme, and may result in the informal consultation not progressing to the next stage.

#### **Officer Comment: -**

- 4.11. This recommendation is agreed; however it is recommended that the level of 'turnout' to consultation, the numbers of 'persons in support' and the situation of the 'those opposed' to scheme proposals be clearly defined.
- 4.12. It is recommended that, for a proposal to proceed, the majority of residents must be in agreement to the scheme and that 'majority' be defined as 'a minimum of 51%'.
- 4.13. It is recommended that, for a proposal to proceed, the response to any consultation/surveys for a proposal should be not less than 30% of the residents within the defined area of a proposed.
- 4.14. It is recommended to be clarified that when both the required turnout and support to a scheme are achieved, the scheme should apply to all residents within the defined area, including any residents who may have opposed such proposals.

### **Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation E: -**

- 4.15. The city currently has a significant number of different zones, with various time restrictions. The panel will recommend a study to look at the feasibility of radically reducing this number, but meanwhile Ward Councillors should consider their proposals within the following framework of restrictions:
- 10am to 6pm, 8am to 8pm or similar
  - 24 hr 7 day week
  - Minimum requirement (e.g. for one or two hours duration) but limiting the variation in the duration of times
  - Event led or very localised condition

**Officer Comment: -**

- 4.16. In respect to the benefits of rationalising existing CPZ's this recommendation is agreed, however it is recommended that the variations to when a scheme applies needs to be clearly defined.
- 4.17. Earlier consultation on the Parking Review, supported by further correspondence from residents, identifies the high number of variations to when a scheme applies, together with schemes which only operate for a periods between 1 and 2 hours, as a cause of clear frustration.
- 4.18. It is recommended that a review be undertaken of existing CPZ's, a review to explore opportunity to reduce the number of scheme variations, ensuring schemes adopt the approach of 'the minimum intervention required to address the residents' problem'.
- 4.19. It is recommended that operational hours of any new CPZ's be selected from a core selection of operational hours as follows:-
- 24 hours (apply at all times)
  - 12 hours (i.e. 8am to 8pm)
  - 6 hours (i.e. 9am to 3pm)
  - 3 hours (i.e. 12 to 3pm)
- 4.20. It is recommended that when determining the most appropriate hours of operation for a scheme, this must also consider any adjacent schemes in operation. There are examples today of schemes, schemes which operate for short periods, where non-resident vehicles simply 'hop between zones' as a means to overcome the restrictions.

**Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation F: -**

- 4.21. If the proposals proceed to formal consultation via the Highways Authority the Cabinet member will receive the consultation feedback and make the final decision under delegated powers.

**Officer Comment: -**

- 4.22. This recommendation is agreed.

**Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation G: -**

- 4.23. Residents controlled parking zones must be kept under review. It is recommended that new zones be reviewed after the first 6–12 months and then beyond the first year on an annual or bi annual basis. Reviews will be an assessment of whether a scheme is meeting its objectives or not. Only if users or ward councillors identify problems will a more detailed review be undertaken.

**Officers Comments: -**

- 4.24. The recommendation that new CPZ's be subject to review is agreed, however it is recommended that this should be not less than 12 months. This is to allow the scheme to bed in and enable a more informed appraisal of the scheme.

- 4.25. It recommended that should a CPZ be determined as being effective, which may simply be through feedback received by the Ward Councillor, then there should be no requirement to review a scheme unless circumstances within the zone change, i.e. a potential new development changes parking demand within the zone.
- 4.26. Where a review is undertaken, this may simply be a review led by local Ward Councillors in engaging with local residents on their views. Subsequently, should a Ward Member have reason to doubt the effectiveness, or harbour concerns, about a scheme, they will be able to request, to the Cabinet Member for Transport, for a review of a scheme.

**Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation H: -**

- 4.27. The panel have considered the current level of charges for residents parking permits and have benchmarked with other local authorities. The benchmarking also looked at differential charging and escalating costs with the number of permits issued. The panel considered however that the current charge of £30 per permit offers good value and should not be increased, and officers confirmed that the charge covers costs of administering the scheme.

**Officer Comment: -**

- 4.28. This recommendation was outside of the scope of the Scrutiny Review, however this recommendation will be considered in light of any potential charges reviews.

**Cooperative Scrutiny Board Recommendation I: -**

- 4.29. The panel benchmarked whether other local authorities capped the number of permits per household. This was not regarded as practical however and the panel therefore recommend that capping should not be introduced at this stage.

**Officer Comment: -**

- 4.30. This recommendation was outside of the scope of the review however this recommendation will be considered in light of any review on permit allocation.

**Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation J: -**

- 4.31. The panel received information on the vehicle dimensions allowed for a resident parking permit. The current arrangements limit this to weight only. The panel recommend that this be extended to include a length and height restriction too.

**Officer Comment: -**

- 4.32. This recommendation is agreed, in respect to vehicle length but not in respect to vehicle height. The dimension of vehicles, such as campervans or vehicles with trailers is known to be a cause of frustration with residents, especially in areas where demand for parking is high as these vehicles occupy in excess of one parking space.

- 4.33. It is recommended that vehicles exceeding the defined 'Planning Parking Standards' bay length of 5.5m be excluded from permits. It is not recommended to restrict vehicles based on height as this does not implicate on available road space. In most cases prohibiting vehicles exceeding 5.5m will also prohibit excessively tall vehicles i.e. advertising vehicles and campervans.

**Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation K: -**

- 4.34. The panel received information regarding the number of parking spaces available in the current controlled parking zones across the city. It was noted that in some areas the permits issued far exceed the capacity for parking. The panel recommend that clarification be sought on whether households currently exempt from council tax could be considered separately and, in particular, whether these houses could be exempt from parking permits in over-subscribed areas of the city.

**Officer Comment: -**

- 4.35. This recommendation is agreed.
- 4.36. A study is to be commissioned to explore the feasibility, and legality, of excluding households which are exempt from Council tax from parking permits. The findings of this review, and any subsequent recommendations, will be presented to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

**Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation L: -**

- 4.37. There are currently 53 resident parking zones across the city. The panel received benchmarking information from other local authorities and how some have only 2 or 3 zones. The panel recommend that officers are asked to undertake a feasibility study to look at how far the zones can be rationalised across the city and whether a more radical approach could be achievable. The study, however, must not lose sight of the needs of users by possibly imposing unnecessary restrictions in an area.

**Officer Comment: -**

- 4.38. This recommendation is agreed. A feasibility study is to be commissioned, linked to recommendation E (reduced variations to the operational timings of schemes), to explore the wider rationalisation of CPZ's. The outcome of this study, and any subsequent recommendations, will be presented to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

**Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation M: -**

- 4.39. The panel received information from officers on the working policies and practices when considering parking or transport related aspects of planning applications. It was clear that closer discussions must take place between Planning, Transport and Parking and that the Supplementary Planning Guidance should be reviewed.

**Officer Comment: -**

- 4.40. This recommendation is agreed.



### **Co-operative Scrutiny Board Recommendation N: -**

- 4.41. The panel agreed that the recommendations in this report, if approved by Cabinet, be forwarded to officers to be included for consideration in the development of the Parking Strategy as part of the Plymouth Plan.

### **Officer Comment: -**

- 4.42. This recommendation is agreed. If approved by Cabinet, this policy will be included within the development of the Car Parking Strategy.

## **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1. There are no costs associated with the adoption of these recommendations. The recommendations within this report define the policy for when a CPZ is an appropriate intervention to address parking problems, how such measures are cooperatively developed and democratically consulted, with the objective of improving the quality of life for residents in the city.
- 5.2. Ward Councillors will use allocated budgets from their 'Living Streets' budgets to undertake consultation within wards to determine the extent of a problem, develop proposals and gauge support for a scheme.
- 5.3. Where support for a scheme has been achieved and a scheme is to be implemented, the costs of associated with this will be met though income received from permits. Council minute no 74(9) 13.07.2000 clarified that the costs of Residents Parking Schemes be financed from the permit price.