

<b>Councillor Roger Elkins, Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure</b>	<b>Ref No: HI06 (20/21)</b>
<b>July 2020</b>	<b>Key Decision: Yes</b>
<b>Chichester Parking Management Plan – phase 1</b>	<b>Part I</b>
<b>Report by Executive Director Place Services and Director of Highways, Transport and Planning</b>	<b>Electoral Division(s): Chichester East Chichester North Chichester South Chichester West</b>

### **Summary**

Chichester is the pilot study for the countywide Road Space Audit (RSA) programme. The study has been underway since 2015 and is now at a point where determination of the Parking Management Plan (PMP) element may be made.

The Chichester RSA was subject to public consultation in autumn 2017 and, following discussion with the South Chichester County Local Committee (CLC), the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agreed to proceed with the PMP element. The PMP aims to future proof parking controls, both to pre-empt the impact of displaced parking following 'incremental' extensions of parking controls but also there is increasing demand for parking as housing developments increase across the city.

An informal consultation exercise was undertaken in March 2019, and the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning approved a revised set of proposals for formal (statutory) consultation in August 2019. That formal consultation was undertaken in February and March 2020.

A total of 968 responses were received to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertisement, with overall figures of 812 (83.9%) objecting, 140 (14.5%) in support and 16 (1.7%) assessed as those that might support if certain changes were made. However, those figures vary across the proposed scheme, with 2 zones showing a majority of respondents being in support, and in other zones a higher percentage in support is revealed if only those respondents that live within the zone are considered.

Many different reasons are cited for objecting, and some of those could be ameliorated to certain degrees. The report makes recommendations to continue to implement some of the zones, with minor modifications, and to redesign and consult further on others.

### **West Sussex Plan: Policy Impact and Context**

A Prosperous Place – providing and managing parking in a well-managed way helps to support local businesses and communities. This is best achieved by implementing settlement - wide parking management plans that are defined by existing and future parking demand.

## **Financial Impact**

Phase one of the scheme is estimated to generate net on-street parking income of £0.076m in a full year, which will be reinvested to fund the implementation of the Parking Management Plan and other eligible Highways and Transport expenditure.

The estimated capital cost of phase one of the scheme is £0.060m. This will be financed by either the On-Street Parking Reserve or external Community Infrastructure Levy funding.

## **Recommendations**

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure approves the phased implementation of the Chichester Parking Management Plan as follows:

- Phase 1 a) Zones A, F (ext), H (ext), N (ext), and S, as illustrated on the plan attached at appendix A, are approved for implementation; and the Director of Law and Assurance is authorised to make the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised with minor modifications to the advertised proposals as detailed in Appendix C (section 1)
- Phase 1 b) Only certain 'No Waiting at any time' elements of Zones B, C, D, G (ext), I, L (ext), O (ext), P, Q, R, T, U, V, W, X and Y, as detailed in Appendix C (section 2) are approved for implementation and the Director of Law and Assurance is authorised to make the Traffic Regulation Order for the advertised no waiting at any time element only;
- Phase 2 a) That further redesign and consultation be undertaken for the zones outlined in Phase 1 (a) and yellow lines detailed under Phase 1 (b) above; this is to follow a period of monitoring of parking patterns following phase 1.
- Phase 2 b) That further redesign and consultation be undertaken for the zones outlined in Phase 1 (b) above; this is to follow a period of longer term monitoring of parking patterns following phase 1, and also to allow for the initial impact of CV19 upon parking usage to be reviewed.

## **Proposal**

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

- 1.1 Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) have been introduced across Chichester city centre and the residential areas just outside it, in a number of stages since 1990. Pressures on the on-street parking space within Chichester continue to grow, causing difficulties for residents (and their visitors) who need to park on-street, impacting on road safety, creating traffic congestion, and, in a strategic context, impacting on overarching environmental considerations of which transport strategy forms a part.

- 1.2 The County Council therefore considered a new approach that seeks to create a longer-term plan to meet current and future on-street parking demands across the city as well as support economic development, improve safety and promote more sustainable forms of transport. Known as a 'Road Space Audit' (RSA), this strategy is intended to complement existing statutory plans and emerging studies in respect of transport infrastructure, parking policy and spatial planning.
- 1.3 In the summer of 2015, the County Council appointed transport consultants WSP/Parsons Brinkerhoff to take forward a pilot RSA study in Chichester. Based on the findings of early work, which included a series of workshops bringing together a range of technical interests, a number of concepts, in support of integrating sustainable transport infrastructure and future development in Chichester, were identified and can be broadly grouped under the following core themes:
  - Tackling Parking Issues (On-Street)
  - Parking Supply and Traffic Management
  - Reallocating Road Space: Improved Places and Sustainable Transport Corridors
  - Reallocating Road Space: "To, Not Through"
- 1.4 With the agreement of the South Chichester CLC, a public consultation on the Chichester RSA took place in autumn 2017, utilising the council's online 'Have your Say' consultation hub. Documents were also displayed at Chichester library and some public meetings were held. Over 200 responses were received, with over 90% being from Chichester residents. Key themes covered in the responses included:
  - the long, technical documents for the audit;
  - the reliability of surveys undertaken;
  - commuter parking in residential areas;
  - public transport options;
  - air and noise pollution; and
  - the lack of electronic vehicle details.
- 1.5 The CLC met in February 2018 to consider the next steps. Officers in attendance put forward the proposal to address the issues raised in the RSA by creating a city-wide Parking Management Plan (PMP), that it was important to ensure that the plan did not displace vehicles to other uncontrolled areas, and so the intention was that the first phase would be rolled out to all areas at once. The CLC resolved to support officers proceeding with design work on a city wide PMP on a phased approach.
- 1.6 Informal consultation took place in March 2019, including 4 drop-in sessions (3 at the City Council's office 1 at Swanfield Community Centre). A range of other media options were used to help further communicate the proposals as follows:-
  - E-Mail to all stakeholders/resident associations
  - Displays at Chichester Library and Chichester DC
  - Evening meetings / CDC Parking Forum
  - Press release, web adverts, Social Media, posters
- 1.7 A total of 1341 responses were received, 1252 via the online hub and 89 written submissions. In general, there was more support for the principle of introducing a PMP than for the detailed proposals consulted on. Residents

from within the proposed PMP were more supportive than those living outside the PMP.

- 1.8 Following a briefing to members of the CLC in July 2019, the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning [decided](#) to proceed with advertising a revised set of proposals in a formal TRO.

## **2. Proposal Details**

- 2.1 The revised proposals retain the informal consultation's 21 additional zones (15 new, 6 extensions) which add to the 11 zones which already exist. In common with controls in those existing zones, restrictions predominantly aim to facilitate parking for residents and their visitors, whilst ensuring safety and tackling issues of traffic congestion and local access difficulties.
- 2.2 The proposals adopted the same rules and arrangements from the existing zones, which take into account the following factors:
- residents' permits;
  - residents' visitors' permits;
  - home carers, healthcare workers and tradesman;
  - options for non-residents;
  - local neighbourhood shops and other short-stay parking locations; and
  - a new approach of 'past this point' controls in no through roads and estates
- 2.3 At the request of local members, the following clarification is provided for care home parking arrangements:
- Staff working at a care home may purchase a non-resident permit if they need to park on-street and if there is spare capacity. These currently cost either £165 or £275 per annum depending on the area parked in. A 25% discount may apply if their vehicle is classified as low emission.
  - If the care home is a registered charity, then a 50% discount may apply to a non-resident permit
  - Wherever possible, limited waiting facilities will be provided close to care homes in order to facilitate visitor parking. Alternatively, visitor permits may be purchased by residential care homes (not day care centres) although the number issued per month may be managed.
  - Residents of a care home will not be eligible to purchase annual permits

## **3. Consultation**

- 3.1 The formal consultation commenced when the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) appeared in the Chichester Observer newspaper on Thursday 13th February 2020. This started the statutory 21-day objection period which ended on 5th March.
- 3.2 A range of other media options were used to help further publicise the proposals as follows:-
- A bespoke page on the [westsussex.gov.uk](http://westsussex.gov.uk) website which included links to the legal TRO documents and a special map tile 'browser' to enable viewing/download of the 90 TRO map tiles covering the extent of the PMP.
  - Press release, social media advertising, banner on website campaign page
  - Displays at Chichester library and Chichester DC office at East Pallant House

- Approx. 500 on-street public notices (similar to the advert)
- A4 posters - County Hall, CDC car parks and public noticeboards
- Emails to Stakeholders (CDC, Parishes, Residents Associations, St Richard's Hospital, Chichester College, Chichester University etc.)

3.3 Responses to TRO formal consultations must be made in writing, and WSCC facilitates this through offering an online response form; emails and hard-copy letters are also accepted. During the 21-day consultation period about 75 enquiries were also received, through email or by telephone, and questions raised were answered as far as possible but always then referred to the online response form to ensure responses were made formally.

3.4 In total, 968 responses were received to the formal consultation. The vast majority of these used the online form, but several were by direct email or hard copy letter. The online form asks for name, address and contact details as well as whether the respondent supports or objects, and a space for further comments. Officers have undertaken qualitative analysis of all responses to help with presenting the results, including the following details:

- Which zone (proposed or existing) they live in or which town if outside Chichester
- Which zone they are commenting on, or if more than one or the whole scheme – to enable results to be broken down by zone
- Assign a 'theme' to the reasons they are citing for objecting
- Whether they 'might support' the proposals if a particular change was made
- List any particular detailed changes suggested

3.5 Consultation results (tables and charts shown at Appendix B)

a. *Overall response numbers*

Fig. 1 shows that 83.9% of the 968 responses objected, 14.5% were in support and 1.7% were assessed as might support if changes were made.

b. *Where responses came from*

Fig. 2 shows that 67.1% of responses came from addresses within the proposed PMP, 2.9% within the existing CPZs in Chichester and 30.0% were from outside Chichester.

c. *Which zones comments apply to*

Fig. 3 shows that 64.7% of responses applied to individual (i.e. single) zones, 3.6% applied to more than one zone and 31.7% to all zones.

d. *Breakdown of support / objection by zone (only those responses that apply to individual zones)*

Figs. 4 (i) & (ii) indicate that only 2 of the 21 zones resulted in more than 50% of responses being in support (Zones F and N)

e. *Further moderation of results in zones A, S & U (only responses from residents of that zone)*

Fig. 5 indicates that in zones A, S & U a higher percentage in support is revealed if only those respondents that live within the zone are considered.

f. 'Themes' or reasons for objecting (all responses)

Fig. 6 indicates the top 3 themes were:-

- Effect on day to day activities e.g. school run, visits, work
- Not wanting to pay as much to park or pay at all
- The proposals are unnecessary, that there is no parking problem

The numbers shown in the chart total 1485, which is more than the 968 responses received, as respondents often cited more than one reason for objecting.

- 3.6 Although the results indicate that, taken as a whole, respondents object to the proposals, further detailed analysis reveals that zones F (Whyke) and N (Little Breach) have a majority of respondents in support. Officers therefore consider it appropriate to recommend proceeding with those two zones. Also, if the results are further moderated to only include those responses received from residents, then higher percentages are revealed in zones A (Donnington) and S (Swanfield). Officers therefore again consider it appropriate to recommend proceeding with those two zones too. In zone H (The Hornet) there were only 3 responses received and no changes to parking layout or type of spaces are proposed for that zone – only a change to allow residents of those new roads being added to apply for residents' parking permits in zone H (new and existing). Officers therefore also consider it appropriate to recommend proceeding with zone H too.
- 3.7 Discussions have been held with members of South Chichester County Local Committee (CLC), and their views on the proposals, in the light of responses, are as follows:-
- Members of the CLC agree in principle with a *Phased Implementation approach* – prioritise the implementation of safety and access related Double Yellow Line parking restrictions in all zones (except where further work is required to take into account school issues), explore full implementation in some zones (e.g. A, S and U) and further design and consultation in others. Continued community and CLC Member engagement is considered necessary.
- The timing of implementation of proposed measures that involve new charges should take into account the economic situation arising from Covid-19 which may take until well into 2021 to become fully clear. Implementation of proposals in zones X and Y are not supported at this time.
- 3.8 Further liaison with local members has been undertaken regarding the implementation of just the safety and access-related parking restrictions in any zones that are deferred. This is considered an essential preventative measure to deal with both existing safety/access concerns and anticipated effects of parking displaced by the introduction of any new zones.
- 3.9 Appendix C lists those minor amendments to the advertised proposals which have been requested by those commenting upon the proposals and which officers recommend as being both agreeable in parking and traffic management terms, and technically possible as a minor modification to the advertised TRO. It also lists those recommended parking restrictions in any zones that are deferred.

- 3.10 In conclusion, there is support from residents of zones A (Donnington), F (Whyke), N (Little Breach) and S (Swanfield) to implement the proposals, with zone H (The Hornet) also being included to allow residents in those roads to apply for permits. There is also support from local members to implement the proposals outlined in Appendix C at the same time.
- 3.11 The proposals outlined in 3.10, if implemented, would be monitored and further changes considered some 2-3 months later as part of a periodic review of the existing CPZ. It is current WSCC practice to undertake reviews of newly introduced parking schemes, and a review of Chichester's existing zones is already planned that can also accommodate this review.
- 3.12 The remaining zones are still subject to potential parking problems arising if displacement occurs, and it is therefore recommended that further redesign and consultation (including readvertisement of any revised proposals) should be considered as a potential second phase of implementation. In the meantime, parking usage in deferred zones would be monitored to assess the impact of implementing the first phase. Phasing implementation in this way would also allow flexibility to respond to changes in parking characteristics post CV-19.

#### **4. Financial and Resource Implications**

##### *Revenue consequences of proposal*

- 4.1 The first phase of the proposed arrangements is estimated to generate additional on-street parking income of £0.100m in a full year. This will fund the estimated £0.024m cost of enforcement and administration.
- 4.2 The remaining estimated net income of £0.076m per annum will be transferred to the On-Street Parking Reserve and will be reinvested to fund the implementation of the Parking Management Plan and other eligible Highways and Transport expenditure.
- 4.3 The table below shows the impact on the On-Street Parking budget, based upon a December 2020 implementation.

	Year 1 2020/21 £m	Year 2 2021/22 £m	Year 3 2022/23 £m	Year 4 2023/24 £m
Revenue Budget (net budget, expenditure funded by income)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Estimated income generated (Phase One)	-0.033	-0.100	-0.100	-0.100
Estimated cost of additional Civil Enforcement Officers	0.008	0.024	0.024	0.024
Estimated net impact of proposals	-0.025	-0.076	-0.076	-0.076

Transfer to the On Street Parking Reserve	0.025	0.076	0.076	0.076
Remaining Budget	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

*Capital consequences of proposal*

- 4.4 The estimated £0.060m cost of the first phase of the scheme is shown below and will be financed by either the On-Street Parking Reserve or external Community Infrastructure Levy Funding.

	Year 1 2020/21 £m	Year 2 2021/22 £m	Year 3 2022/23 £m	Year 4 2023/24 £m
Current Capital Budget	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Impact of Proposal	0.060	0.000	0.000	0.000
Revised Capital Budget	0.060	0.000	0.000	0.000

## 5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The proposals are the subject of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), the process for which is subject to national regulations. As well as specifying how the TRO process is to be conducted, it stipulates that the Council shall consider all objections (made in accordance with the regulations) and not withdrawn.
- 5.2 If the Council decides to proceed with any of the proposals, then once all physical works and other implementation aspects such as the issue of permits has been completed, a notice of 'making' the TRO shall also be published in a local newspaper.
- 5.3 The 'notice of making' shall also specify that, if any person wishes to challenge the validity of the order (or the powers used by the Council), then they may do so by applying to the High Court within 6 weeks from the date of that notice.

## 6. Risk Implications and Mitigations

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Action (in place or planned)</b>
Legal challenge	This is governed by national regulations and is only possible within the first 6 weeks of the order being made (sealed). The Council mitigates against this by ensuring that all due process is complied with, that outcomes are not predetermined at any stage and due consideration is made of objections received.
Parking demand increases rapidly, partly due to less use of public transport as a consequence of CV19,	The recommended approach of phasing is good preparation for responding to displacement issues in due course. The original intention of the RSA was to promote

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Action (in place or planned)</b>
leading to new parking problems arising in uncontrolled areas	city-wide controls to assist such 'future-proofing'.

## **7. Other Options Considered (and reasons for not proposing)**

### 7.1 Do nothing option

Although it is possible to leave all existing parking restrictions unaltered, parking problems will still remain in uncontrolled residential streets closest to the city centre. Some of the TRO responses (generally those in support) cite those difficulties. In support of wider transport planning strategies, it is considered that some elements of the parking management plan are still warranted.

### 7.2 Proceed with all zones as advertised

This would be contrary to the majority view of responses, although it would offer the maximum 'future proofing' against any displacement of parking into uncontrolled areas. The recommendation to redesign and consult on deferred zones in phase 2 will offer a further opportunity to consider this problem, and also reassess increasing demand for parking as housing developments increase across the city.

## **8. Equality and Human Rights Assessment**

8.1 The intention of the proposed PMP is to ensure fairer access to road space for all users.

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

## **9. Social Value and Sustainability Assessment**

9.1 All customers will be positively affected by good management of on street parking across Chichester.

9.2 This will be experienced in the form of:

- a. Improved coordination with other sustainable transport planning strategies and traffic management measures
- b. Safer arrangements for parking near junctions
- c. Protection for through traffic on main arterial routes
- d. Better management of the demand for parking in currently uncontrolled residential areas
- e. Priority for residents and their visitors who rely upon on-street parking
- f. Less traffic congestion and pollution arising due to vehicles 'searching' for parking spaces in uncontrolled areas
- g. Improved arrangements for Blue Badge holders in residential areas
- h. Safeguards for short-stay parking near local neighbourhood shops

## **10. Crime and Disorder Reduction Assessment**

The County Council does not consider it necessary to arrange an extension of an established Agency Agreement for any crime and disorder issues. Officers have previously consulted with Sussex Police, who share this view.

**Lee Harris**  
Executive Director  
Place Services

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

**Contact Officer:** Mike Horton ([michael.horton@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:michael.horton@westsussex.gov.uk))  
Project Officer – Parking Strategy Team  
0330 222 6345

### **Appendices**

A Proposed plan of phased implementation of zones  
B Chichester PMP TRO response tables and charts  
C Details of minor modifications to advertised proposals

### **Background Papers**

None