

## **Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee**

**March 2020**

### **On-street Parking to Support Traffic Management - Update**

**Report by Executive Director Place Services and Director of Highways, Transport and Planning**

#### **Summary**

Providing on-street parking in a well-managed way helps to support local businesses, residents and communities. Road Space Audits are now being used to identify where there is a need to implement better settlement wide parking solutions that support the County Council's aspirations in terms of economic development, improved safety and sustainable transport.

This report provides an update on the progress of the strategic parking management plan programme, as agreed by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure in December 2018.

#### **The focus for scrutiny**

The Committee is invited to:

- Note and comment on the revised programme set out in Appendix A of this report.
- Determine any learning/lessons that can be applied to the future development of Parking Management Plans

### **Proposal**

#### **1. Background and Context**

- 1.1 Revised principles relating to on-street parking management and in particular Road Space Audits (RSAs) were considered by the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee on the 6<sup>th</sup> December 2018. It was concluded by the Committee that the existing CLC arrangements for creating Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's) were sufficient and that the recommendations outlined by officers were not supported. However, members were keen to express their support for the continuation of the Road Space Audits to identify parking problems across West Sussex
- 1.2 Later that month, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure considered the revised principles, as well as the views of the Committee and agreed a revision to the decision making process for Road Space Audits as well as a strategic parking management plan programme to implement on-street parking controls in various locations across the county (Reference HI25\* (18/19))

1.3 The following recommendations were approved:

- That the decision to consult upon and /or formally advertise Road Space Audit parking management proposals is taken by the Director for Highways and Transport following consideration by the relevant County Local Committee.
- That the decision to implement Road Space Audit parking management plans, any subsequent changes to parking arrangements contained with the plans, and any changes to the on-street parking charging structure is taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, in consultation with County Local Committees and following consideration of any objections.
- That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure agree a strategic parking management plan programme to implement on-street parking controls in various locations across the County

1.3 It was also agreed that County Councillors would continue to be fully and closely consulted at all stages of development and reviews of RSAs / parking management plans. In particular they would:

- Be fully appraised of the development of RSAs including all proposed on-street changes and, once implemented, the ongoing operation of each scheme.
- Contribute to, consider and comment on any proposed on-street changes to parking management.
- Report any comments or concerns to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure and Director for Highways and Transport prior to, and as part of, decision reports.
- Within certain parameters, to ensure consistency, agree the nature and degree of informal and formal consultation to be undertaken.
- Consider reports outlining consultation responses received during the informal design consultation.
- Consider any changes to existing on-street charges.

## **2. Proposal/Progress**

2.1 The RSA programme approved in December 2018 set out the intended County Council priorities for the financial years 2018/19 and 2019/20.

2.2 In line with the recommendations set out by the Executive Task and Finish Group in 2017, the RSA priorities consisted of Crawley (including Manor Royal), Burgess Hill and Worthing, alongside the pilot study in Chichester. Due in part to the resource requirements of studies in Chichester, Crawley and Worthing, but also to facilitate more collaborative/strategic working, it was agreed that a study in Burgess Hill and East Grinstead should be initially funded and progressed by Mid Sussex District Council.

- 2.3 It is still the case that for 2021/22 and beyond the programme could be extended to areas such as Bognor Regis, Littlehampton and Arundel. However, it is also possible that throughout this period, RSAs will be progressed (and funded separately) in locally identified areas such as Barnham, Hassocks, Midhurst and Lancing. Any additions to the programme will be subject to approval by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure.
- 2.4 The RSA programme in Appendix A sets out the latest timescales against those originally included in the 2018 report and provides an explanation for any variations.
- 2.5 In summary, progress on the RSA programme has been slower than expected with delays on specific projects ranging from approximately 6 months to 16 months. The main reasons for these delays are as follows:
  - Project Scale – In Chichester, the conversion of the plans of the city wide proposals into the required format for a statutory consultation necessitated the production of over 90 corporate GIS map tiles which proved to be extremely demanding in terms of time and resources. However, one positive outcome from this has been the development of an online map browser, easing the task of viewing multiple parking proposals over a wide area. This will now act as a template for future studies.
  - Member/Stakeholder Agreement – In some areas it has not been possible to achieve agreement on particular aspects of the RSA, whether it relates to the overall scope or specific aspects such as proposal design or costs. The need for further engagement has had an inevitable impact upon the overall programme, especially as some projects such as in Crawley, are dependent upon others (Manor Royal) to progress.
  - District/Borough Council Election Cycle – In some areas it has not been possible to progress with Member/Stakeholder engagement in the months leading up to local elections.
- 2.6 The delays in progressing the RSA priorities has had a knock on effect on the next tier of studies such as in Shoreham and Horsham but it is hoped that these can be progressed as soon as possible.
- 2.7 The pilot study in Chichester is the most progressed of all RSAs and is currently subject to a statutory consultation on the final design. In line with the 2018 Cabinet Member Decision, the decision to undertake the statutory consultation was taken by the Director for Highways and Transport following a comprehensive public/stakeholder consultation and detailed consideration by the South Chichester County Local Committee.

**3. Resources**

3.1 The revenue consequences of the revised (2020) RSA programme are as follows:

	2018/19	Current 2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
--	---------	--------------------	---------	---------	---------

	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Revenue Budget (net budget, expenditure funded by income)	0	0	0	0	0
Road Space Audit – Feasibility and Design (estimated)	0.086	0.160	0.613	0.120	0.210
Funded by Mid-Sussex District Council	0	0	-0.120	0	0
Funded by Section 106 Contributions	-0.044	-0.061	0	0	0
Funded by On-Street Parking Reserve	-0.042	-0.099	-0.493	-0.120	-0.210
Remaining Budget	0	0	0	0	0

For information, the revenue consequences of the original RSA programme (December 2018) were outlined as follows:

	Current Year 2018/19 £m	Year 2 2019/20 £m	Year 3 2020/21 £m	Year 4 2021/22 £m
Revenue Budget (net budget, expenditure funded by income)	0	0	0	0
Road Space Audit – Feasibility and Design (estimated)	0.145	0.495	0.270	0.140
Funded by Mid-Sussex District Council		-0.120		
Funded by On-Street Parking Reserve	-0.145	-0.375	-0.150	-0.330
Remaining Budget	0	0	0	0

3.2 The cost of RSA feasibility studies and design work is estimated at £1.189m from 2018/19 onwards. Section 106 funding of £0.105m has been secured so far and Mid Sussex District Council will fund the feasibility studies for Burgess Hill and East Grinstead areas, estimated at (£0.120m). The remaining balance of £0.964m will be met from the County Council's On-Street Parking Reserve.

3.3 The revised RSA programme does not have any confirmed capital implications because it does not determine whether and how specific parking plans will be implemented. However if plans are implemented capital costs would be met from the following sources;

- Additional income generated from new parking controls implemented
- Section 106 funds
- Community Infrastructure Levy
- Local Enterprise Partnership Growth Programme Funding
- Capital Funding

- 3.4 The additional on-going enforcement and back office costs associated with any parking management plan would be met from the additional income generated from the implementation of new parking controls.
- 3.5 The proposals are driven by operational rather than financial considerations but it is expected that there will be a net revenue contribution to the On-Street Parking Reserve. Officers are currently working through the financial implications of the programme revisions. Any surplus may be reinvested in the Highways and Transport Service as appropriate.

## Factors taken into account

### 4. Issues for consideration by the Select Committee

4.1 The Committee is invited to:

- Note and comment on the revised programme set out in Appendix A of this report.
- Determine any learning/lessons that can be applied to the future development of Parking Management Plans

### 5. Consultation

- 5.1 Each RSA has/will have its own comprehensive communications strategy. From an early stage, the relevant County Councillors, as well as officers and other key stakeholders play a key role in determining the scope of the study as well as the timescales for progression. Once an initial study is complete, the findings are shared with all parties above as well as the general public.
- 5.2 As and when a detailed design has been prepared (i.e. for a Parking Management Plan), it is subject to at least two public consultations, one of which involves public exhibitions/events and an online engagement process. A detailed design will only progress to a three week statutory advertisement subject to consideration by the relevant County Local Committee (CLC) and then the approval of the Director of Highways and Transport.
- 5.3 Final proposals will only be implemented subject to further CLC consideration and the approval of the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure after consideration of any objections.

### 6. Risk Implications and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigating Action (in place or planned)
The risk with not proceeding (in full or in part) with the proposed changes identified within a particular parking management plan is resident and stakeholder dissatisfaction. As part of the engagement process, a large number of residents and stakeholders may have indicated that the parking situation in their area is getting more difficult and that they would like the	This may require an increased resource to manage requests for community funded highway schemes and/or CLC priority Traffic Regulation Orders.

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Action (in place or planned)</b>
<p>County Council to take action. There is also a significant risk that cases of inconsiderate or dangerous 'displacement' parking could increase in unrestricted roads/areas.</p> <p>The risk with proceeding with proposals of this scale is that many residents and businesses within a particular area find the measures unacceptable as their normal parking habits are affected. A number of respondents are likely to object to any form of County Council intervention and express a wish for things to remain as they are.</p>	

## **7. Other Options Considered**

- 7.1 There is clear need to ensure that a consistent and strategic approach to the implementation of parking management plans, which adhere to the agreed programme is taken. The Council faces particularly challenging financial circumstances and there is a need to ensure accountability for how the investment of over £1m in RSAs is allocated and spent. It is therefore appropriate that the Cabinet Member has close oversight of the programme. In so doing it is recognised that local members have a key role to play in delivering successful outcomes for our communities.

## **8. Equality Duty**

- 8.1 In this case, a comprehensive communications strategy for each RSA (see 5 above) will ensure that all groups have an opportunity to comment on any proposals that come out of it and to have any potential impact in terms of the Equality Duty included in the consideration of any decision.

## **9. Social Value**

- 9.1 There are no significant social value issues arising from these proposals
- 9.2 Any parking management plans that are introduced will be closely monitored and an opportunity to make minor amendments will be available as part of an annual review process.

## **10. Crime and Disorder Implications**

- 10.1 The County Council does not consider parking management plans to create any crime and disorder issues. Officers have previously consulted with Sussex Police, who share this view. It is considered this will not change if implementation of any parking management plan takes place

## **11. Human Rights Implications**

11.1 There are not considered to be any Human Rights Act implications

**Lee Harris**  
Executive Director  
Place Services

**Matt Davey**  
Director  
Highways, Transport and  
Planning

**Contact:** Miles Davy ([miles.davy@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:miles.davy@westsussex.gov.uk))

### **Appendices**

Appendix A – Revised Road Space Audit Implementation Programme

### **Background Papers**

On-Street Parking to Support Traffic Management (Cabinet Member Report December 2018)