

IPS Review 2020 - 2025

Officer Comments

1. WSCC Highways

There have been enquiries and TRO requests received from several local communities (mainly on individual roads) where residents want the parking of camper vans in the highway to be prohibited; sometimes because people are living or sleeping overnight in them, sometimes just because they are considered to be visually intrusive. Perhaps you might consider including something in the IPS, to minimise the risk of local pressures leading to the current piecemeal approach spreading further.

Parking Manager Response – A briefing note on Motorhome parking will be prepared separately for the Cabinet Member as this is considered to be an operational matter that sits outside of the IPS.

2. WSCC Transport Planning and Policy

The draft strategy is easy to read and follow. The main themes within the strategy flow through from national policy to regional and county policy and then conclude with the table at the end. It is clear but thorough. We just have a few comments to make which are listed below:-

The introduction part of the strategy talks about the benefits of well thought out parking. An additional benefit could be mentioned here which would be about cycling and walking – in terms of “well thought out parking” also enables safer cycling and walking (and in some instances cycle parking) in addition to the other benefits already mentioned in the document.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will look to review wording

On page 22, there is discussion of Demand Management and Road User Charging in relation to the LTP. This section could clarify the difference between demand management through parking charges and other types of demand management, such as congestion or road charging. It would be best not to mention the LTP in terms of demand management or road user charging – this was probably from some years before when there was a political appetite for this type of model.

Presently, the County Council’s overall approach is moving away from this type of demand management/road user charging. Instead of the text on road user charging, the strategy could have more information on Road Space Audits. They have been mentioned under Place Based Planning, but more information could be added in the section on page 22 – it could say something along the lines of “an RSA can be used to inform decisions on how we manage the network, including the reallocation of road space” with the intention that RSAs are used to support large scale reallocation of road space, more than specific schemes and TROs. This way, we set the context for the proper use of RSAs and still maintain the ability to affect supply and demand – but without using unpopular terminology.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will look to review wording

On page 39, with regards to pay & display and the discussion on moving towards new machines that take cards. Whilst this is a natural progression, it might be worth including the consideration of gathering evidence on the need to keep cash as well as cards. Whilst it is appreciated that this is more labour intensive and costly for WSCC, there is also a risk of excluding certain sections of the community when changing over to cards.

Parking Manager Response – the upgraded machines will still accept cash

It would be good if this document could reflect (or link to) district or borough parking policies within the Local/Neighbourhood plans. For example, how does the new Parking Plan for Worthing link in with the WSCC Parking Strategy – is this being considered? (both mainly focus on off-street parking, some local parking policies request higher off-street parking requirements than in the WSCC parking guidance)

Parking Manager Response – Some of the DC/BC off-street strategies are currently under review so it is suggested that the IPS be amended once these are all completed

The strategy seems to mainly focus on residential parking – there is potential for greater change in management of parking in some other key locations, such as schools and hospitals.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will investigate

Generally promotion of car clubs, car sharing, public transport improvements, new cycle routes, and providing journey planning are only done through developers within new developments for new residents, not for existing residents. Text within the strategy might give the impression that this sort of improvement or promotion will happen as standard, across the whole county.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will look to review wording

Improving parking in Chichester, Littlehampton and Bognor Regis should also consider bus routes. The strategy should give a mechanism for this to happen, outside of the mechanism of RSAs. Stagecoach have highlighted to us that there are several pinch points along their routes in these areas relating to parking that negatively impact on the bus services that they provide.

Parking Manager Response – There is an existing mechanism in place for dealing with such requests within existing CPZs or in proposed schemes. Outside of these areas, a TRO request should be made. Will see if wording can be reviewed.

The document could give consideration to seasonal changes in demand. For example, it could give consideration to peak holiday times at Chichester – Witterings. Whilst, that part of the queuing and congestion is related to people finding spaces to park – obviously more related to private parking - this queuing still has a significant impact on the local road network – which the document could give consideration to. The majority of the document seems to focus on town centre parking.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will investigate

3. Worthing Borough Council Parking Services

Given the various declarations of climate emergency, I wonder if a more explicitly 'sustainable' tone is required? This seems very much a 'business as usual' approach. I haven't found any recognition of the role that parking management can play reducing carbon, and whether more radical approaches (e.g. not encouraging driving into/ parking in town centres) might be necessary in the future?

As an example, a quick word search indicates that references to carbon reduction and sustainability are in the first couple of chapters of the document (that is, the Policy section) rather than the proposals/ action plan.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will investigate

I wonder if the section on 'On and Off Street Parking Management' needs more of a 'sustainability' emphasis. e.g. IPS 4 refers to balancing needs and maintaining economic viability - should it refer also to doing so for wider sustainability reasons?

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will look to review wording

IPS5 refers to discouraging car use in congested urban areas - should this not be happening in other types of areas too? Should it be made clear that this is to reduce carbon emissions as well as congestion itself?

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will look to review wording

There is nothing specifically about EV charging points in the IPS action plan, although the Electric Vehicle Strategy is summarised in chapter 2. Are there any relevant actions that can be delivered or reflected through the IPS action plan?

Parking Manager Response – Noted. Suggest amending IPS once actions from the EV Strategy are clarified.

4. WSCC Road Safety

Just wondered if there needs to be a reference to electric scooters? Hire and park space, as it seems the trials only endorse use of hired scooters, and this may expand once the trials are over.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will look to review wording

5. Mid Sussex District Council

General support for the Strategy and its proposals

Policy 1 – acknowledge that the CPE review is underway but we request more collaboration and involvement with the process as there is the potential for significant impacts on our staff and services. We also note that the Spring 2020 timescale is unrealistic.

Parking Manager Response – Noted

Policy 5 – support the intention, but would request that stronger clarity is required on the policy for future management of new developments in CPZs and

permit eligibility. Currently a disparity between eligibility and policy and does not support car free developments creating a disjointed approach, leading to customer expectations not being met and potential parking demand / displacement.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will investigate

Policy 9 – greater clarity required around the lower tier community RSAs / light touch proposals and managing the expectations of implementation and implications of enforcement demands arising as a consequence.

Parking Manager Response – Noted

Policy 10 – confirmation sought that enforcement contract implications will be considered as part of any new TRO considerations.

Parking Manager Response – Noted

Policy 12 – support the proposals to consider CCTV enforcement, especially around schools which is resource heavy. Also welcome the consideration of vehicle removals as this is a missing element of the enforcement contract and opens opportunities to consider DVLA delegation of powers and potential income streams.

6. In addition to the above, Planning colleagues comment that section 2.1.10 needs to be updated as PPSs and PPGs were abolished in 2012 and replaced by the NPPF, the policy background here is therefore out of date.

Parking Manager Response – Noted, will review wording.