

Report

Report to:	Roads Safety Forum
Date of Meeting:	30 October 2019
Report by:	Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)

Subject:	Review of Residents' Parking Permit Zones (RPPZ) Policy
----------	--

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ Outline the progress to date with regard to the review into Residents' Parking Permit Zones (RPPZs) Policy and overall conclusions that have emerged

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1. The Forum is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) that the contents of this report be noted; and
- (2) that the recommendations detailed at paragraph 5.2. be confirmed as the agreed position of the Forum and that it be noted that, these will be considered at a future Community and Enterprise Resources Committee for approval.

3. Background

- 3.1. The requirement for residents' parking permits in areas throughout South Lanarkshire followed the introduction of the Car Parking Charter in 1997.
- 3.2. The parking needs of commuters, residents and visitors often result in a high demand for both short-term and long-term parking within the area and the Council receives a high volume of correspondence on this subject from both residents and commuters, either directly or via elected representatives.
- 3.3. There are already significant RPPZs in East Kilbride, The Village (East Kilbride), Hamilton and Rutherglen. To park in these zones, residents or their visitors need to display a permit, however, it does not mean there will always be a space available. There are also several smaller areas where permits have been issued to both residents and businesses, including Carluke, Rutherglen and Cambuslang.
- 3.4. At the Community and Enterprise Resources Committee of 21 August 2018, the commencement of a review of the current RPPZs policy, overseen by the Roads Safety Forum, was approved and, due to significant parking pressures being experienced, the commencement of initial consultation for new RPPZs at Hairmyres in East Kilbride and in the area surrounding Cambuslang Station was also agreed. This was in addition to the extension of the RPPZ in the Montrose Crescent area of Hamilton and modest adjustments to the boundary of The Murray zone of East Kilbride.

- 3.5. At the Community and Enterprise Resources Committee of 22 January 2019, it was also agreed that consultation would be undertaken with regard to the potential for a RPPZ in the vicinity of Blantyre Station. This was due to ongoing parking pressures.
- 3.6. The three RPPZ consultation exercises have now concluded and a paper is expected to be considered by the Community and Enterprise Resources Committee on 12 November 2019. For completeness, the extensions of the RPPZs in the Montrose Crescent area of Hamilton and in The Murray area of East Kilbride have now been implemented.
- 3.7. The paper before you today provides a summary of the work undertaken in relation to the review of the current RPPZ policy and the proposed way forward. Section 4 outlines the key matters discussed and debated and section 5 proposes recommendations that the Forum is being asked to support.

4. Matters Discussed/Debated and the Outcomes

- 4.1. It was agreed that the Roads Safety Forum would be the overseeing group for the RPPZ policy review and, at the Forum meeting of 10 October 2018, a special meeting of the Forum was requested to discuss matters in more detail. This meeting occurred on 15 January 2019 with a summary of the discussions presented at a subsequent Forum meeting of 12 March. At these meetings, the Roads Safety Forum was asked to consider and discuss several matters. The following summarises the discussions, comments and observations.
- 4.2. The view of the Forum was that RPPZs were an effective demand management approach to assist in minimising the impact on residents in areas of competing parking demand. RPPZs should be seen as an additional approach that officers can use to complement existing approaches such as waiting and loading restrictions (i.e. yellow lines).
- 4.3. The Forum considered that the main factors (positive and negative) to be considered when considering the introduction of RPPZs were the need to balance the competing demands of residents, businesses, employers and commuters. Parking displacement into adjacent streets or areas was also an area of concern, as was the possible disincentivisation of the use of public transport.
- 4.4. With regard to the potential need to expand specific existing RPPZs, or amend their boundaries, it was agreed it would be necessary to consider each zone on its merits.
- 4.5. The Forum agreed that RPPZs could be considered at all locations where parking pressure on residential areas was seen as a concern and not only in areas of high demand e.g. near town centres/train stations where parking is at a premium. There was a specific discussion on whether there were any specific areas, not covered by existing or proposed RPPZs, where RPPZs should be seen as a priority for implementation. It was suggested that all elected members, not just those on the Forum, be consulted on this. Eleven areas were subsequently identified following feedback from elected members for potential future RPPZ assessment and these are outlined in Appendix 1.
- 4.6. There was discussion on whether areas around schools should be considered for RPPZs and the consensus was that other measures such as waiting and loading restrictions, Keep Clear zig-zags and similar would generally be more appropriate.

- 4.7. The Forum felt that a key consideration when implementing any demand management approaches areas (e.g. RPPZs or waiting and loading restrictions) was the ability to effectively enforce restrictions. It was the general feeling of the Forum that it was not best practice to promote restrictions that cannot be effectively enforced. This included reference to evening and weekend enforcement not presently being undertaken by Parking Attendants and the potential need for this to be reviewed.
- 4.8. While it is important to manage demand in residential areas, it is also essential to ensure that suitable facilities and capacity remain available for businesses and commuters. The Council has a suite of policies contained within the Local Transport Strategy promoting sustainable travel to encourage a shift away from the private car. We must also be mindful of the Scottish Government's recent Climate Emergency declaration and the heightened need to continue efforts to promote and encourage more sustainable travel.
- 4.9. With regard to the implementation and prioritisation of any extended or new RPPZ, the Forum's view was that assessment criteria for particular areas should be developed. Noting the position in paragraph 4.8, criterion 6 has been added to those previously discussed by the Forum to date:-
1. proximity to town centres
 2. proximity to significant parking generators (e.g. rail stations, hospitals, education establishments)
 3. road geometry/lack of off street parking/narrow streets
 4. scope for other demand management measures such as waiting and loading restrictions
 5. potential for increased parking provision (e.g. new park and ride facility)
 6. impact on adjacent businesses and commuters of any new RPPZ
- 4.10. Officers were tasked with considering how such assessment criteria might be developed so as to allow potential zones to be ranked or prioritised. In order to develop this, the proximity of the parking attraction (i.e. the generator of parking demand) to the centroid of the potential zone was considered to be the key factor.
- 4.11. Each of the criteria was given a weighting factor. For example, a railway station would attract all day parking with limited turnover when compared to a leisure centre, so would receive a higher weighting. The potential zone was then given an assessment score based upon the attractions located within ten minutes' walk of its centroid. This score was combined with the weighting factor for each of the attractions and this generated an overall score for a potential zone.
- 4.12. This methodology was applied to several existing and potential zones, to test its robustness, and considered by senior Roads and Transportation Officers. It was apparent, however, that such a numerical based scoring system was too prescriptive and could not accurately capture all of the potential dynamics and issues that would require to be considered within an area. While it could be used to consider areas as high, medium or low priority, it would not be appropriate to use the individual scores generated to prioritise one location over another.

- 4.13. It is, therefore, proposed not to use a formal scoring system but, instead, the assessment criteria outlined at paragraph 4.9 would be used by officers, in a less prescriptive manner, to conduct both an assessment of potential future RPPZs and, thereafter, consider the conclusions in line with available resources and other Council priorities or projects.
- 4.14. Decisions on the management of operational and traffic management matters on the road network, by way of promoting Traffic Regulation Orders, presently falls to the Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources) and the Head of Roads and Transportation Services. It is, therefore, proposed that this arrangement would continue and, if an RPPZ was to proceed, it would be promoted in the same manner as any other Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 4.15. Given increasing financial pressures and potential to expand/introduce new RPPZs, a key consideration for the Forum was whether the time was now right to consider charging a small fee for residents' parking permits. Officers presented to the Forum the administrative and employee costs associated with the existing RPPZs in operation.
- 4.16. After much debate, the view of the Forum was that there should be some sort of fee which, at the very least, covers the administrative costs associated with issuing around 6,900 permits largely to residents but also to some business premises. The costs previously reported to the Road Safety Forum were in the order of £40k, but a further review has confirmed these to be closer to £50k. The agreement of Forum members to introduce a fee links directly to Audit Scotland's report from 2013 encouraging Councils to better understand their unit costs and seek to recover them where discretionary services are being provided.
- 4.17. A range of potential fees were developed by officers for consideration and these were discussed at the meeting of the Forum held on 12 March 2019. After consideration of all aspects of the introduction of a parking permit fee, including the impact on residents, enforcement and cost, Forum members agreed fully on the principle of introducing a fee for parking permits and proposed the following options:-
- ◆ option 1 a fee of £10 per permit for a period of 2 years
 - ◆ option 2 a fee of £20 for the first permit and £10, thereafter, for a period of 2 years
 - ◆ option 3 a fee of £20 for the first 2 permits with an ascending scale, thereafter, for a period of 2 years
- 4.18. Option 1 would potentially generate £50k (assuming a modest reduction in the take up of permits) which would cover the costs of issuing permits and deliver a modest surplus. Option 2 would potentially generate £69k which again covers the costs of issuing permits albeit delivering a greater surplus and Option 3 would be around £92k delivering a much larger surplus. These estimates assume that the introduction of a fee would potentially reduce the number of permits issued by around one third.
- 4.19. Officers have subsequently considered the three options and recommend that a fee of £10 for every permit (i.e. Option 1) is made for a period of 2 years for all existing, extended and subsequently proposed RPPZs. This will establish the principle of charging a permit fee and is in accordance with Audit Scotland's recommendations. It will also allow officers to implement the new arrangements and better understand the potentially reduced demand for permits moving forward (i.e. due to fee implementation). It is also felt that a fee of £10 is a figure that the majority of

residents would accept as reasonable and would go some way to reduce any adverse response to the introduction of such fees.

- 4.20. The Forum also noted that permits were issued manually on a rolling programme every two years and came to the view that the primary process for applying for permits should be on-line but that all other existing options should remain available, but those applying for and paying for permits should be encouraged to use online systems. The two year time validity period for permits was also agreed by all Forum members as a reasonable period to allow for reduced administrative costs, but not so long as to perhaps lose control of the number of permits in operation which would invariably happen over a longer period.

5. Conclusions/Recommendations

- 5.1. In summary the Roads Safety Forum has overseen and developed the review of RPPZ Parking Policy through discussion with Officers and following consideration of various papers and information.
- 5.2. The Forum is therefore asked to support the following statements and specific recommendations noting that these will be taken to a future Community and Enterprise Resources Committee for consideration and approval.
1. RPPZs are an effective demand management tool and should now be considered for future expansion or rolled out to new areas, subject to an appropriate assessment by officers and the introduction of a fee for issued permits.
 2. Permits issued to both residents and businesses in any existing, expanded or new RPPZ will be subject to a £10 fee for each permit and be valid for a period of two years.
 3. Requests for new or expanded RPPZs can now be considered and an assessment using criteria (at para 4.9) will be undertaken to review the need or otherwise of any proposed RPPZs.
 4. The Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources) will decide on whether to proceed having considered the Officer's assessment report.
 5. The introduction of new or expanded RPPZs must balance the competing demands of residents, businesses, employers and commuters.
 6. The enforcement of demand management measures (e.g. RPPZs and other waiting and loading restrictions require to be suitably resourced, including during the evening and at weekends.
 7. The primary process for applying for permits should be on-line but all other existing options should remain available at this stage.
- 5.3. With regards to timescales it is proposed that those areas outlined in Appendix 1 be subject to the assessment exercise proposed at paragraphs 4.13 and 4.14 before the end of May 2020. Thereafter, those that are to progress would be implemented in line with the statutory process associated with Traffic Regulation Orders. The whole process of promoting an Order takes some nine months though it can take considerably longer if objections are received.
- 5.4. Parking Demand Management can be a very emotive subject especially where increases or new charges are being considered. Reaching a consensus across all political parties and concluding the review into RPPZs should be seen as a very positive development by the Forum.

- 5.5. Subject to confirmation by the Forum today, officers now have another approach to manage the competing demands in areas especially in those areas close to town centres or where there are facilities such as railway stations, educational establishments, hospitals or other medical premises nearby as is the case for the three areas where consultation was undertaken. The imposition of a £10 fee also means that the financial pressures associated with administering this approach can be managed effectively, allowing for wider roll out if necessary.

6. Employee Implications

- 6.1. There are no significant employee implications associated with the recommendations in this report as this work will be undertaken by existing employees. There are a number of interrelated parking workstreams and priorities which need to be considered with regards to resourcing and timescales. The timescales outlined in paragraph 5.3, therefore, reflect the available resources and other competing priorities.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1. There are no significant financial implications associated with the recommendations in this report. There would, however, be potential capital and additional administrative costs associated with introducing any new or extended restrictions and particularly with implementing new RPPZs, as additional permit applications would require to be processed and issued. Implementation of any extended or future RPPZs would have to be prioritised in line with available budgets at the time of implementation, albeit it is recognised that in part at least this will be self financing.

8. Other Implications

- 8.1. There are no significant risks associated with this report, nor any environmental implications. There are no implications for sustainability in terms of the information contained within this report.

9. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements

- 9.1. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a change to an existing policy, function or strategy and therefore, no impact assessment is required
- 9.2. There is no requirement to undertake any consultation at this time in terms of the information contained in this report.

Michael McGlynn

Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)

3 October 2019

Link(s) to Council Values/Ambitions/Objectives

- ◆ Improve the quality of life of everyone in South Lanarkshire
- ◆ Improve the road network, influence improvements in public transport and encourage active travel
- ◆ Work with communities and partners to promote high quality, thriving and sustainable communities

Previous References

- ◆ Community and Enterprise Resources Committee 22 January 2019
- ◆ Road Safety Forum 12 March 2019

List of Background Papers

- ◆ Executive Committee 23 February 2011 Agenda Item 9 “Member/Officer Task and Finish Group - Parking Management Strategy”
- ◆ Executive Committee 5 October 2011 Agenda Item 9 “Parking Management Strategy – Review by Members/Officers Task and Finish Group”
- ◆ Community and Enterprise Resources Committee 21 August 2018 Item 12 “Review of Residents’ Parking Permit Zones (RPPZs)”
- ◆ Road Safety Forum 10 October 2018 “Review of Residents’ Parking Permit Zones (RPPZs)”
- ◆ Road Safety Forum 15 January 2019 “Review of Residents’ Parking Permit Zones (RPPZs)”
- ◆ Community and Enterprise Resources Committee 22 January 2019 Item 12 “Parking Demand Management Review”
- ◆ Road Safety Forum 12 March 2019 “Review of Residents’ Parking Permit Zones (RPPZs)”

Contact for Further Information

If you would like inspect any of the background papers or want any further information, please contact: -

Colin Park, Roads and Transportation Services

Ext: 3653 (Tel: 01698 453653)

E-mail: colin.park@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Additional potential RPPZ's

Reid Street, Rutherglen

Tuphall Road, Hamilton

Abercorn Drive / Chestnut Crescent area, Hamilton

Station Road, Blantyre

Biggar

Dundas Place, The Village, East Kilbride

South Avenue, Carluke

Fairyknowe Gardens; Bothwell

Main Street area, Uddingston

Craigallian Avenue, Halfway

Westwood area, East Kilbride