

**Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills, Executive Director for Environment and Economy**

Report to:	<b>Planning and Regulation Committee</b>
Date:	<b>06 October 2014</b>
Subject:	<b>Stamford Permit Parking Scheme</b>

**Summary:**

The County Council has been working with SKDC who are proposing to introduce a Permit Parking Scheme in parts of Stamford. Extensive consultation took place prior to the proposals being formulated. This report considers the responses received following the formal consultation and advertising stage and recommends that the objections received are overruled.

**Recommendation(s):**

The objections are overruled and that the proposed Permit Parking Scheme is introduced, as advertised, with the very minor amendments suggested in the report, with a review being carried out after 12 months.

**1. Background**

1.1 For more than 10 years there has been a demand from many in Stamford for a permit parking scheme (PPS) since there are many properties in the town centre without any room for off street parking.

1.2 The County Council's policy is that any PPS needs to be promoted and administered by the local district council. Most districts, apart from the City of Lincoln, were unwilling to promote PPS until Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) was introduced since, prior to that, Lincolnshire Police were unwilling to carry out any enforcement.

1.3 South Kesteven District Council (SKDC) have a policy for introducing PPS where there is a demonstrable demand and they have carried out a wide-ranging consultation exercise in Stamford to determine which areas of the town would support a PPS.

1.4 We have worked with the district council to prepare a scheme that would introduce a form of permit parking for those with properties and businesses in a prescribed area (see appendix A). The scheme would be administered by the

district council, who have indicated that a permit for a designated vehicle would cost £50 per annum. This would allow unlimited waiting on certain streets but other users without a permit would still be able to park but they would be limited to parking for a 2 hour period.

1.5 SKDC produced "Frequently asked Questions" as part of the consultation process and this is included as Appendix B.

1.6 The County Council have now carried out formal consultation on the proposed scheme and public advertising has also been carried out. This report outlines the responses received from the consultation and advertising and provides our response.

## **2. Consultations**

### **2.1 Consultation Process**

2.1.1 The advert and consultation process have resulted in a significant number of objections, comments and expressions of support. These are set out below with officer's comments below each one in italics.

2.1.2 The statutory consultees were consulted on 17<sup>th</sup> July including the three county councillors for Stamford.

2.1.3 Councillors Brailsford and Trollope-Bellew are members of the committee and will determine their position during the committee meeting. Cllr Hicks has not responded.

### **2.2 Objections Received**

2.2.1 A response from Stamford Town Council was received on the 5<sup>th</sup> September. They object to the proposed scheme for the following reasons:-

2.2.2 Stamford Town Council is very concerned (a) at the chronic lack of free on-street parking in and around Stamford town centre and (b) that recent proposals by Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) will reduce the current clearly inadequate number of parking spaces still further (eg Castle Dyke, Star Lane).

As a busy trading town for both local residents and visitors, and one that is more reliant than most on on-street parking because of poor public transport provision, Stamford would benefit greatly from being a destination where parking near its shops is made as easy as possible. The more difficult it is to park, the greater the number of potential shoppers who will abandon the town centre and patronise the edge of town trading estates instead, all of which provide ample, convenient free parking.

The Council requests that LCC (a) reconsider any proposals that will result in a loss of on-street parking and (b) investigate the possibility of increasing the number of spaces by removing yellow lines from roads unless they are absolutely necessary.

*Since the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement we have received positive comments about the availability of space on street. SKDC is promoting the scheme as a result of long standing requests from residents of the town. Stamford Chamber of Commerce has not objected to the scheme.*

*The proposed scheme will not result in the loss of any on street parking spaces although it is accepted that some of these will be filled by residents with parking permits. We do not believe there are many places where no waiting restrictions could be removed safely but we will keep this under review.*

2.2.3 There were no comments from any of the other statutory consultees.

2.2.4 A total of 51 individual letters of objections were received.

2.2.5 18 object to the exclusion of Adelaide Street from the proposals.

*Although the parking on Adelaide Street is not being included as a residents parking area those living here are within the scope of the consultation and therefore are able to apply for a permit for those streets that have restrictions. Further consideration will be given to Adelaide Street as part of the planned future review when a better understanding of any "ripple" effect will be known.*

2.2.6 28 object about the possible 'knock-on' effect as a result of the proposed implementation of the parking zone in and around the Northfields area, namely, New Cross Road, Princess Road, Kings Street, Queens Street, Alexandra Road, Victoria Road and Emlyns Street. These suggest there will be displacement of parked vehicles rippling out into the surrounding streets which are not covered under the proposed scheme. They also object to the cost proposed for a permit.

*It is recognised that implementing the proposed scheme may result in the need for further measures to be considered but it is suggested that this is done after the scheme has been in operation for at least 12 months. The cost of the permit is set by SKDC.*

2.2.7 One resident has objected that parking will be displaced in and around Kings Road, New Cross Road and Queens Street areas, and that a No Waiting at Any Time Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) should be installed at these junctions for a distance of 10metres. Further comments were also made regarding vehicles parking on the footway.

*There are numerous junctions in and around the Town where this issue is prevalent together with vehicles parking illegally on footways and in some instances causing obstructions. In these cases, we would rely on the Highway Code and Police enforcement action if the parked vehicles are causing an obstruction.*

2.2.8 Two residents from the Northfields area request that the proposed residents parking scheme should not be implemented at all due to possible displacement of parked vehicles.

*This is one option open to the committee but it is not recommended as there has been wide and long standing support for PPS.*

2.2.9 One local resident requests that South View Terrace be included in the parking enforcement zone.

*Although the parking on South View Terrace is not being included as a residents parking area residents are within the scope of the consultation and therefore are able to apply for a permit for those streets that have restrictions. After a period of settling in, other areas of waiting restrictions may be identified and brought forward as a new TRO.*

2.2.10 One resident from Bentley Street has objected to the scheme to make Bentley Street, Stanley Street and the surrounding roads in Stamford a residential parking area on the basis that, only the Council will benefit from this proposed order since residents will now have to pay for parking on street which is free at present.

*The scheme is being promoted by SKDC. The cost of the permit is to fund the set up costs and the on-going administration. The areas proposed resulted from extensive consultation carried out by SKDC.*

2.2.11 Two residents from Conduit Road have objected to the scheme to make Conduit Road, Recreation Ground Road and Vine Street a residential parking area on the basis that they believe they do not fall within the policy of SKDC for the scheme. They suggest that parking should be limited to residents and that visitors to Stamford should only be able to use designated car parks. One of the residents also objects to the proposal of dual use parking bays and also requests some form of parking regulation in the centre of the Town as well as copies of the consultation feedback from the Chief Constable, Stamford Town Council and South Kesteven District Council.

*As part of the preliminary consultation conducted by SKDC, all of the above had been considered and as such they identified the requirement to accommodate visitors/residents/businesses to the area. All the statutory consultees have been consulted as per current policy and only Stamford Town Council have objected. This report is a public document so the objector will be able to see details of all the responses received.*

2.2.12 One business owner has objected to perceived loss of on street parking and the high cost of charges for parking compared to other towns.

*Businesses are included in the scheme which allows them to purchase parking permits. The cost of permits has been set by SKDC who are also responsible for the off street car parks. There will be no charge for parking on-street.*

2.2.13 Two residents object as they feel the proposals are unnecessary and also propose that SKDC reduce the cost of parking in Cattle Market/other SKDC car parks to fifty pence per day.

*SKDC have promoted the scheme following extensive consultation. Consideration of charges for off-street car parks are not part of this consultation.*

2.2.14 One resident objects to having no more than 1 permit per household and concerns over visitor passes upper limit.

*The limit of one permit per household / business is due to the limited number of available parking bays in Stamford. The amount of permits being made available is capped to ensure a balance is maintained between residents, businesses, visitors and shoppers. The cap will be reviewed as part of the planned future review process when demand is fully understood.*

2.2.15 One resident from High Street St Martins Close commented that the road layout of The Close is narrow, does not have pavements along its full length, many residents are elderly or young and that there are no proper turning areas. They also comment that the street accommodates visitors / customers to nearby businesses and residents suffer from disturbance from visitors to the local restaurants and pubs. In addition they comment that there are only 3 parking bays and tradesmen are unable to park.

*The only change proposed at this location is the proposal to remove the 'Access Only' prohibition notice, which is non enforceable due to it being a Cul-De-Sac. There are a number of garages attached to this site owned by SKDC and in the event of tradesmen/visitors requiring permits to park in this area, SKDC will be operating a visitor permit system.*

2.2.16 One local resident requests that Church Lane be included in the parking enforcement zone.

*Residents of the area are already within the scope of the consultation and therefore are able to apply for a permit for those streets that have restrictions. After a period of settling in, other areas of waiting restrictions may be identified to be consulted on at a later date if deemed necessary.*

2.2.17 One resident from Drift Road objects to the proposal as they consider that this order grossly violates the principal of fair and equal access to public roads for all. They believe it is an attempt to enhance property values at public expense and that it will potentially damage Town centre trade.

*The permit parking scheme is being promoted following extensive consultation with residents and businesses in the town.*

## **2.3 Support**

2.3.1 Six letters of support were received without suggestions and a further 18 that included some suggestions.

2.3.2 Two letters suggested that the 1 hour time limit should remain in place instead of the proposed 2 hour.

*We have worked closely with SKDC and believe that a general 2 hour limit provides consistency and reduces confusion.*

2.3.3 One response commented that the plan for St Peters Hill shows a break in the bays due to an old road layout and that it should be possible to make it one continuous bay.

*Agreed, we will amend the proposals to include a 6.5 metres reduction of No Waiting at Any Time (NWAT) and insert 6.5 metres of Dual Use Permit holders 8am to 6pm no return 1 hour – limited waiting 8am to 6pm no return 1 hour.*

2.3.4 One response suggested St Peters Hill to be resident only as worried about continued damage to vehicles and three responses suggested there should be some resident only bays instead of dual bays and evening restrictions to be applied.

*It is believed the current proposals provide a sensible compromise between the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.*

2.3.5 One response suggested that dual use bays encourage short stay parking when car parks should be used.

*It is believed the current proposals provide a sensible compromise between the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.*

2.3.6 There were two responses suggesting the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm be changed to 9.00am to 4.00pm and reduced limited waiting to 1 hour or 30 minutes to discourage shoppers.

*It is believed the current proposals provide a sensible compromise between the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.*

2.3.7 One response asked for more effective enforcement.

*We have received positive comments that the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) has improved conditions in the town.*

2.3.8 Four comments received that more than 1 permit per household should be considered and concerns over visitor passes upper limit.

*The limit of one permit per household / business is due to the limited number of available parking bays in Stamford. The amount of permits being made available is capped to ensure a balance is maintained between residents, businesses, visitors and shoppers. The cap will be reviewed as part of the planned future review process when demand is fully understood.*

2.3.9 One comment received suggesting permits should be made available for Cattle Market Car Park.

*This is an off street car park; we have agreed with SKDC under the scheme proposals not to change any available off street restrictions within this consultation.*

2.3.10 One comment that houses with off street parking were not allowed permits.

*SKDC have confirmed those properties identified within the consultation zone are able to apply for a permit from SKDC even if they have off street parking.*

2.3.11 One respondent understood that Scotgate was to be brought under the scheme, but has been omitted from SKDC's Website:

*Residents on Scotgate are able to apply for a permit as they are within the permit parking scheme. Further consideration will be given to Scotgate as part of the planned future review when a better understanding of any "ripple" effect will be known*

2.3.12 One response saying there was confusion regarding the current Traffic Regulation Orders on Barn Hill and All Saints Place.

*As the predominant length of the waiting restrictions are in Barn Hill, the added length of increased parking bays recently amended were part of the Barn Hill TRO to avoid confusion.*

2.3.13 One response raised concerns regarding long term parking at St Peters Green.

*Residents on St Peters Green are able to apply for a permit as they are within the permit parking scheme.*

2.3.14 Two comments were received that Broad Street on the South Side, should have been included as part of the proposed TRO's.

*This location has been designated for shoppers and visitors.*

2.3.15 One concern was raised over the restrictions being implemented over seven days per week.

*It is believed the current proposals provide a sensible compromise between the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.*

2.3.16 One response suggested that the proposals on St Pauls Street are unlikely to change the current practice of Blue Badge Holders from parking on Double Yellow Lines.

*It is hoped that with the increased numbers of available parking bays for the disabled this will encourage them to park within the permitted bays.*

2.3.17 One request for Adelaide Street to be included with the resident parking scheme.

*See the comments in the 'Objections' section above.*

2.3.18 Three responses commented that restrictions are proposed for Conduit Road, Vine Street and Stanley Street, but the main issue on these roads is not during the day, but the evenings, when there are too few spaces for all the residents. It would help if bays could be created in Conduit Road where there are currently Double Yellow Lines which prevent parking on verges.

*There is insufficient road width to allow parking on both sides and insufficient funds available and issues with utilities apparatus to allow parking on the verge.*

2.3.19 One response raised concerns in relation to limits of restrictions in the area of Bath Row, St Peters Vale and Kings Mill Lane not being clear.

*We will conduct a site survey to ensure conformity.*

## **2.4 Other Comments**

2.4.1 A resident of Queen Street raised concerns that if the scheme were to go ahead they felt it would have a great impact on Queen Street and surrounding streets in the vicinity, namely Northfields area, New Cross Road, Princess Street, Kings Road and Alexandra Road.

*It is recognised that implementing the proposed scheme may result in the need for further measures to be considered but it is suggested that this is done after the scheme has been in operation for at least 12 months.*

2.4.2 One respondent was broadly in support of the scheme, however confirms they would be 100% behind scheme if any given parking bay were to be some resident only spaces and that the whole scheme be operational full time (ie including evenings and weekends).

*It is believed the current proposals provide a sensible compromise between the needs of residents, businesses and visitors. Weekends are already part of this proposal.*

2.4.3 There are several roads mentioned by residents, which are outside the scope of the consultation and concerns have been raised with the possible 'knock-on' effect that displaced parking may bring.

*It is recognised that implementing the proposed scheme may result in the need for further measures to be considered but it is suggested that this is done after the scheme has been in operation for at least 12 months*

2.4.4 Comments were received to enquire whether it would be possible for the parking fees in Cattle Market to be reduced.

*Consideration of charges for off-street car parks are not part of this consultation.*



2.4.5 A local business commented that the scheme should not have restrictions on Sundays and that the time restrictions should be no return 2 hours.

*It is believed the current proposals provide a sensible compromise between the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.*

2.4.6 One resident requested that Adelaide Street be included in the parking enforcement zone.

*Although the parking on Adelaide Street is not being included as a residents parking area those living here are within the scope of the consultation and therefore are able to apply for a permit for those streets that have restrictions. It is recognised that implementing the proposed scheme may result in the need for further measures to be considered but it is suggested that this is done after the scheme has been in operation for at least 12 months*

2.4.7 Concerns were raised by a resident over the displacement of parking in and around Kings Road, Newcross Road and Queens Street areas, and that No Waiting At Any Time be installed at these junctions. Further comments were also made regarding vehicles parking on the footway.

*There are numerous junctions in and around the Town where this issue is prevalent together with vehicles parking illegally on footways and in some instances causing obstructions. In these cases, we would rely on the Highway Code and Police enforcement action if they consider vehicles are causing an obstruction.*

2.4.8 One resident from Station Road asks whether a permit would be specific to an address.

*The permit would be valid for all the restricted parking under the scheme but would be specific to a resident/vehicle.*

2.4.9 One resident requested that High Street St Martins be included in the parking enforcement zone.

*Although the parking on High Street St Martins is not being included as a residents parking area those living here are within the scope of the consultation and therefore are able to apply for a permit for those streets that have restrictions. It is recognised that implementing the proposed scheme may result in the need for further measures to be considered but it is suggested that this is done after the scheme has been in operation for at least 12 months.*

2.4.10 One resident from Conduit Road commented that whilst they support the majority of what we propose they have a number of concerns which ideally should be changed if our proposal are to be accepted on introduction. Namely: -

- a) Dual Use Bays – should not be dual use, should be Residents only. If we insist on dual use bays then times should be 09:00hrs 16:00 hrs for 1 hour only (due to student parking and visitors to the squash court and other clubs).

- b) Effective enforcement; while it is appreciated that additional staff may be recruited to police these areas, it is strongly believed they are currently not effective in a wide area of their duties.
- c) Concerns over reasons for extension by 3 metres to the existing No Waiting At Any Time restriction at the vicinity of No 43 Conduit Rd and location of the Limited waiting bays plate.
- d) Request to reinstate illegal parking on the rough ground to the south East corner of Conduit Road (prior to CPE).

*a) It is believed the current proposals provide a sensible compromise between the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.*

*b) Comments noted. SKDC can request additional enforcement if they are willing to fund it.*

*c) The minor changes suggested can be accommodated. We have already spoken with this resident and have agreed that the plate would be sited in a way as not to impede on any future access to the residents property and it would still be legal/enforceable (ie within 15m of the start of the restriction).*

*d) There is insufficient road width to allow parking on both sides and insufficient funds available and issues with utilities apparatus to allow parking on the verge.*

### **3. Conclusion**

3.1 There has been a considerable response from residents and businesses on this proposal. As this report has confirmed, many of the suggestions received were already included in the proposals. It is recommended that the scheme is implemented as proposed, with the very minor changes outlined in the report and then reviewed after a period of twelve months.

#### **a) Policy Proofing Actions Required**

N/A

### **Appendices**

These are listed below and attached at the back of the report	
Appendix A	Location Plan
Appendix B	Frequently Asked Questions

### **Background Papers**

No background papers within Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 were used in the preparation of this report.

This report was written by Brian Thompson, who can be contacted on 01522 553183 or [brian.thompson@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:brian.thompson@lincolnshire.gov.uk).