

Appendix D

CHESC Recommendation 1 - Clarity needs to be provided on the existing Parking Scheme designs that are not covered by the proposed New Parking Management Strategy; or clarifying any impact from the new Strategy on existing designs.

The initial three-year programme for CPZ development is outlined in Appendix B and the main report (section 2.2) outlines the reasons why particular projects have been included in the programme.

It is proposed that the projects forming the initial programme would not be subject to the initial trigger stage, the assessment stage and the prioritisation stage, as they are either already underway or are long-standing priorities. However, any other project would be subject these stages before it could be added to the programme.

Tier 1 projects would also not be subject to the 'consultation thresholds' outlined in the new framework. This is because Chichester and Horsham are reviews of existing CPZs and Manor Royal is at the final consultation stage. Tier 2 projects are classified as 'new' and therefore would be subject to the consultation thresholds.

No changes to the framework are required as a result of this recommendation.

CHESC Recommendation 2 - The proposed 50% thresholds are considered too high, with 40% being considered a more appropriate aspirational level for both overall and in favour responses. Caveats should be included in the policy to allow consideration of schemes with a lower response, with judgement from local County Councillors to be part of the consideration throughout the process. Flexibility to take into account specific circumstances is considered necessary.

It is not considered necessary to amend the aspirational thresholds at this time as the CPZ Framework already allows consideration of schemes with a lower response rate and/or other specific circumstances. It should also be stressed that as the Framework/Programme will be reviewed regularly by the Director for Highways, Transport and Planning, there will be an opportunity to change the aspirational thresholds, based on the actual response rates from 'in-progress' schemes. So, for example, if initial rates are particularly low, the aspirational threshold could subsequently be lowered to 40%.

In response to concerns raised by the TFG, the framework has been re-drafted as follows:

Accepting that unanimity is extremely unlikely, a consultation response rate of 50% will therefore be the aspiration.

Where the initial response rate is lower than 50% or where less than 50% of those who responded supported the idea of a CPZ and its progression, the responses may be judged on their own merits and the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will decide whether to make an exception and allow the

project to progress to the next stage. As part of this decision making process, consultation will take place with the Cabinet Member and the relevant County Councillors.

CHESC Recommendation 3 - Clarity is needed for consultation catchment areas. How this relates to roads in the area and other stakeholders such as landlords and business owners.

A consultation catchment area (or 'study area') would consist of those roads initially forming part of the submission to WSCC as well as some peripheral roads, to account for potential displacement etc. The final extent of the study area would be agreed with the relevant County Councillors before any engagement with residents/businesses begun. Engagement would primarily consist of letters being sent to all individual properties, including commercial premises, within the study area and including private roads.

Residents/businesses in private roads would be advised, as part of this initial engagement, of the options for future parking management. For example, WSCC could consider yellow lines in private roads for safety/access purposes but not permit controls or pay and display facilities

Letters would be sent to individual properties and thereby the current occupants/residents would be expected to respond. Landlords are not considered to be residents/occupants of a property and would not be contacted separately. Landlords and business owners would be classified as 'non-residents' but would still be eligible to apply for particular types of permit such as Traders Permits or Visitors Permits.

No changes to the framework are required as a result of this recommendation.

CHESC Recommendation 4 – The policy needs to include consideration for dropped curb and EV charging requests.

It is not considered necessary to include specific information on Vehicle Cross Overs (VCOs) in the CPZ framework as WSCCs existing VCO policy already sets out an approach regarding requests for EV charging facilities. Any potential changes to this approach should therefore be considered in the context of the VCO policy rather than the CPZ framework.

Officers will ensure that the TFG are consulted on any potential changes to the VCO policy.

No changes to the framework are required as a result of this recommendation.

CHESC Recommendation 5 – The relationship with this policy and the Community TRO, Community Highway Scheme and existing CPZ Review processes needs to be considered against the five-road threshold limit to ensure there are no gaps in the process. Transitions from one policy to the other needs to be considered, taking into account the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee's

recommendations regarding the Community TRO process arising from its 24 November meeting.

It is accepted that further clarification can be provided on the relationship between CPZs and other TROs. The framework has therefore been re-drafted as follows:

It is also preferable that a submission refers to an area comprised of at least 5 roads, all of which must be public highway, that are either adjoining or in close proximity. In the majority of cases, it would be inefficient for the County Council to consider taking action in a smaller number of isolated roads as such schemes could have a disproportionate cost in terms of enforcement and administration, may create expectations that the Council is unable to meet and have limited traffic or parking management value for the surrounding area.

Operational guidance issued to Local Authorities via the Traffic Management Act (2004) states that a typical CPZ (sub-zone) should not exceed 12 roads so a submission that refers to an area comprised of between 5 and 12 roads is considered most appropriate. Submissions comprised of less than 5 roads may still be considered in exceptional circumstances but a submission from an individual household or road will not trigger an investigation.

In cases where a request for a CPZ has been submitted by an individual household or road, or has no County Councillor and Local Council support, or has not been considered an exceptional circumstance, representatives will be advised to obtain further evidence and support from residents in surrounding roads in order to submit another request. Alternatively, they may be referred to the County Council's Community TRO or Community Highways Scheme application process if it is considered that access and/or safety in a single road or small number of roads could be improved by a physical measure, such as build outs, or the introduction of waiting restrictions such as yellow lines or another restriction that does not involve the use of on-street permits.

CHESC Recommendation 6 - Parish/Neighbourhood Councils need to be included in the Trigger and Consultation Stages to ensure local Councillor involvement.

A District, Borough, Parish, Town, City or Neighbourhood Council will be contacted as standard practice in any CPZ consultation exercise.

The framework has also been re-drafted as follows in response to the recommendation put forward:

Evidence of initial support from the relevant County Councillor(s) and representative(s) of a 'Local Council', including a District, Borough, Parish, Town, City or Neighbourhood Council, will also be required as part of a submission.

CHESC Recommendation 7 - The scoring level assessment should not use actual numbers of responses as a measure, due to the different demographics in each area.

In response to this recommendation the framework has been re-drafted as follows:

<p><i>Level of Support (Resident/Stakeholder)</i></p>	<p><i>Less than 10% of the total households form part of the initial submission</i></p>	<p><i>10-20% of the total households form part of the initial submission</i></p>	<p><i>20-50% of the total households form part of the initial submission and/or identified in local policy</i></p>	<p><i>Over 50% of the total households form part of the initial submission and/or identified in local policy</i></p>
---	---	--	--	--