

## 8th January 2019 -Overview and Scrutiny Board

### Response to the Call – In

We the undersigned members of the Council "call in" the decision of the Cabinet made on 12th December 2018 "Keep Havering Moving" adoption of Parking Strategy and Highways Resurfacing Policy for the following reasons:

#### Draft Parking Strategy

1. The report fails to demonstrate that the changes will deliver less congestion and better parking management. Where will the additional manpower required be coming from to enforce additional parking restrictions? It is also unclear from the draft parking strategy that the proposals enable the Council to respond positively to the stated pressures.

The proposals are designed to discourage all day, on street commuter parking. Making on street parking less convenient for commuters will lead to fewer vehicle movements in the borough and discourage all day use of valuable parking spaces.

The additional manpower will be from increased numbers of Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's) whom will be appointed as necessary. As Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) are introduced, the areas will be added to the enforcement patrols and managed as per normal operational arrangements. At this stage it is assumed that 2 additional CEOs will be required, these will enforce the new and existing restrictions. CEOs are also cost neutral.

The strategy does not detail the proposals; this will be picked up as part of the Parking Operational Plan which will respond to the needs of the Residents and Businesses on a case by case basis.

2. There is no evidence/data to demonstrate that the proposed parking arrangements will meet local need. How do the council know what that need is?

In the last few years a large number of CPZs have been introduced to areas which attract commuter parking which then inconvenience local residents.

Tailoring proposals to meet local need is achieved through informal consultation with residents in the affected areas, listening to their concerns and reporting the results back to the ward councillors for their consideration. Through this democratic process a scheme is then designed.

The detailed scheme is then publicly advertised as per the statutory legal requirement of the Council.

Proposals will include provisions for residents, and their visitors and deliveries, disabled bays, plus local business by the way of business permits and pay & display for their customers.

3. Many areas around commuter hubs already have parking restrictions to stop commuter parking. How will compulsory controlled parking zones improve on this?

The aim of a CPZ is to provide the maximum and most relevant on street parking, where it is safe to do so, for local residents, businesses and their customers whilst restricting commuters from leaving their vehicles parked on street all through the working day.

A controlled parking zone will incorporate parking restrictions together with resident, business bays and shared bays (this can incorporate pay and display bays near local amenities) all as relevant to the specific local situation.

Existing parking restrictions apply to all vehicles whether owned by residents, local businesses or commuters therefore sometimes inconveniencing residents as much as commuters. E.g. A single yellow line hour morning restriction.

The permit parking allows the resident to have the choice to purchase a permit, rather than being penalised for parking on a no waiting restriction.

4. There is a lack of detail on which roads will be impacted by the compulsory CPZs.

Studies have shown that assuming a standard accepted fast walking pace of 4mph commuters are willing to park up to 1 mile from a rail station (15 minute walk) to save money on train travel fares, or to secure “free” on street parking. This all day commuter parking restricts on street parking space for residents, their visitors or deliveries and local businesses including their deliveries and customers.

The proposed CPZs in Havering are slightly less stringent in that the boundary being considered is 1km or ten minutes fast walk from the rail station (rather than 1mile /15minutes walk). The CPZ would include all roads within that area and would be bounded to natural boundaries such as main roads or natural geographic boundaries wherever possible. This avoids partially treating a road and so helps prevent simply moving the parking down the street or to next available street outside the CPZ.

The CPZs are not compulsory; however areas that do not have an existing CPZ that is within this 1 Km area surrounding rail station will be considered for a CPZ.

5. There are numerous references in the draft strategy to CPZs, but it does not fully explain whether this actually means resident parking permits, as opposed to yellow lines, it needs to be made very clear whether CPZs around commuter hubs are one or the other.

CPZs are a combination of restrictions including double yellow lines, single yellow lines, loading and waiting restrictions plus residents permit parking bays & business permit parking bays. They work by considering all kerbside space within a zone and assigning that space the most relevant safe use. Their primary aim is to provide the maximum safe on street parking space for residents and businesses possible while preventing commuter parking. After that restrictions would be used to restrict any parking at any time where it would be unsafe either for pedestrians or other vehicles. CPZs are typically areas where drivers are required to display a permit when parking their car in a zone.

6. Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) proposals should be the subject to extensive local consultation on a ward by ward basis rather than a borough-wide imposition.

The Council does require an overall strategic policy that suits all residents and does not discriminate between wards. This overarching strategy proposes a CPZ on all roads within 1km of a station.

The specific detail of how all the available kerbside space within each CPZ will be designated will be the subject of extensive local consultation with the affected residents, businesses and ward members

7. The financial implications suggest that there are none in the strategy, but may be in delivering actions. The financial implications should clearly set out there may be financial implications for residents should they be subject to resident parking permits and the current charges.

That is correct. This proposal aims to set a Borough wide Strategy for CPZs. There is no financial implication in proposing the strategy.

8. The financial implications should include the local authority parking accounts (as required by s55 of The Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984) for the last two years to add financial context.

This can be found in the public domain within the Annual Report (attached link):

[https://www.havering.gov.uk/downloads/download/647/annual\\_parking\\_reports](https://www.havering.gov.uk/downloads/download/647/annual_parking_reports)

9. How will the council identify those areas that need removal of grass verges to provide additional parking space and how will the conversion work be funded?

The intention of a CPZ is to deter commuter parking out of the area. Often this is sufficient to return enough on street parking to satisfy local resident demand and so there is then no need to convert grass verges to parking.

In the instances where on street parking availability is so limited that even removing commuters doesn't leave enough space for resident demand then consideration could be given to converting verges to parking. It is anticipated this would be a smaller number of locations and this conversion is funded from any surplus revenue generated from the wider CPZs.

10. Conversion of grass verges to hard standing should not necessarily be limited to areas where CPZs are introduced.

Conversion of grass verges to hard parking will not be limited to CPZs. In areas of high parking demand which are over 1km from a rail station, and so not subject to commuter parking, this would still be considered as a means of alleviating parking stress (subject to funding).

However within 1km from a rail station the only way to restrict commuters or any other out of area parking on converted grass verge would be to include the converted area within the CPZ.

11. Parking pressures differ widely and are more acute in neighbourhoods of high housing density.

Agreed. Therefore areas of high housing density that are also within 1km of a rail station and so subject to the additional commuter parking will have an even higher parking pressure. That is why these areas are being considered first.

If ward councillors highlight areas susceptible to parking pressures outside of 1km from stations these areas could still be considered for standalone CPZs on a case by case basis and the results reported back to the ward councillors.

12. How will the lack of parking spaces on new developments be managed to reduce the impact on available parking space outside the development?

This is controlled by our colleagues in Planning and is all controlled within the Planning Application of the development. The Planning Application is subject to various conditions like Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) and webCAT (web connectivity accessibility toolkit). The Time Mapping (TIM) feature of this indicates the time taken to travel to and from a selected location.

13. There should be a review of existing regeneration proposals which currently tend to provide less parking capacity which a knock-on effect of increasing demand will have leading to pressure on areas nearby to the individual regeneration.

This is led by Planning and when planning applications are received. The parking strategy will allow for consideration of one off CPZs that are more than 1km away from a rail station if there is an on street parking pressure identified.

We do request that s.106 money from the development is set aside for parking reviews to existing areas surrounding a development and this could be extended to consider the introduction of individual CPZs.

An example of this is the Beam Park area in Rainham where the developer will fund the CPZ in the development and the surrounding roads.

14. There is no evidence to demonstrate that parking enforcement is fair, transparent, and robust and evidence led.

All parking enforcement is based on local needs and locations are visited on a rota and also as needs arise. Parking enforcement is carried out in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 which provides statutory guidance on how local authorities should enforce parking restrictions. The Councils enforcement process is transparent, fair and robust and subject to scrutiny through the appeal process.

All enforcement income is published in the Annual report which again is a public available. Further information regarding appeals is published by London Councils on their website.

The Parking Operations Plan (POP) will provide further procedural information to support where and how parking enforcement is managed. This will be made available on the Councils website.

15. There is no evidence to demonstrate that parking arrangements will be consistent around all transport hubs and Town Centres. What impact assessment has been carried out to ascertain the impact on local businesses resulting from the proposed change?

The specific detail of how many parking bays of what type and what specific restrictions will apply to what kerb space will be the subject of the design and consultation on each specific CPZ. Residents, businesses and ward councillors will all be asked their opinion as part statutory consultation process.

Additionally a recent survey was carried out in town centres asking shoppers their parking habits. The results can be made available.

16. How will increasing parking charges around businesses support their growth?

The proposed parking charges are structured to encourage regular turnover for patrons to local amenities and instil greater confidence that a parking space will be available near to local shopping areas.

The proposed increase in parking charges will be consistent and fair across the Borough and reduce the confusion to residents who may visit more than one parking area within the Borough.

17. What consultation or evidence gathering has been undertaken with the local business community in forming this strategy?

The specific detail on any proposed CPZ or other standalone parking restriction would be subject to normal consultation with local businesses, residents and ward members.

18. There is a lack of information on the worst congestion hotspots in the borough.

The Council recently agreed its local Air Quality Action Plan which highlighted areas of congestion and in turn poor air quality. We already know that the areas of greatest parking congestion are around stations and shopping areas which the strategy endeavours to address.

19. The report/recommendations should be more specific on how the strategy will improve air quality and improving road safety supported by evidence in each case

The Parking Strategy sets out our approach, objectives, priorities, and some specific actions that we will look to progress in the coming years, protecting local space for local residents near commuter hubs. In turn this will help to improve local air quality and road safety. Havering roads should not be congested and parked by commuters from outside the borough taking advantage of our lack of Controlled Parking.

20. What are the incentive schemes to encourage residents to move away from using their car and own less polluting vehicles? There is no detail on where the money will come from to do this.

The Parking Strategy is aimed at managing existing parking demand and not specifically targeted at encouraging residents to move away from using their car or from owning less polluting vehicles.

However CPZs by nature require residents to pay for a permit to park on street and this in itself, at a small level, may cause them to question whether they could do without a second or third vehicle altogether.

In the future the Council could explore incentive schemes that favour environmentally friendly vehicles alongside installing electric charging points.

21. The outline proposals point to inconsistency of approach across the borough. It is unclear whether the report is proposing a one size fits all policy or tailor-made solutions.

The Parking strategy proposes a consistent approach across the Borough. In areas within 1km from a rail station this will constitute a 'one size fits all' with standardised hours and approach predominantly aimed at removing on street commuter parking and maximising on street parking space for local residents and businesses.

Standalone zones outside these locations could consider less robust parking restrictions with possibly shorter hours and days of operation.

22. Who will decide how each zone will be tailored to meet the needs of local people? If a zone is tailored made, how can it be consistent across the borough?

The hours of operation and the design will be consistent across the Borough (for all CPZs within 1km of a rail station). The intention will be to maximise the number of parking spaces for local residents and businesses within the zone. The outline design will be subject to statutory consultation with residents, local businesses and ward councillors and feedback used to refine the final design.

23. How will the council determine what is considered a commercial vehicle?

Nearly all boroughs in London account for work vehicles that are taken home at night for residential purposes, as long as they are under a certain height and length. The average small van is not considered as oversized in most London Boroughs.

Business bays or shared use business bays could be introduced on flank walls so not to be outside residents houses for vans to park in areas of high demand.

24. How will the targeting of overnight parking of business vehicles be addressed? How will it affect local businesses? What threshold would be applied (e.g. a BT Van or a Simply Flowers from Cranham van)?

This can be written in to the permit criteria. Proposal to penalise vehicles that are not registered to a home address or business address registered in the Borough. Typically includes long wheel based vans which are more obstructive and take up more space on the highway and limit sight lines causing safety issues.

25. There is insufficient evidence within the report to support the assertion that the proposals complement other strategic policies such as the Local Plan, Air Quality Action Plan, and the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment;

The strategy does not contain this detail is does highlight how it compliments and takes into consideration all relevant Council agreed policies.

26. Where is the parking strategy within the Local Plan?

The Local Plan was agreed before the Parking Strategy was drafted, however, Parking was consulted during the draft phases of the Local Plan

27. The Cabinet and members scrutinising such proposals should receive more information and data relating to borough wide car journeys relating to travel to work, travel to study (schools and colleges).

Collecting and analysing this information would be an extensive transport planning exercise and is detailed, time consuming and costly to run on a borough wide basis.

The Parking Strategy is aimed at managing existing parking demand and providing a clear and consistent approach across the Borough.

28. The Parking Operation Plan should be prepared in draft form for consideration with the Parking Strategy.

The final Parking Operational Plan will be available on the Council website

29. Where is the evidence to demonstrate the level of out of borough commuter parking and where it is located?

This evidence has come from local consultations where residents have cited early morning arrivals of vehicles and departures late at night (in some cases which disturb sleep patterns of the residents).

Without extensive and costly parking surveys cannot categorically confirm that these vehicles are from out of Borough. However standard parking design practice, officers' observations and experience, residents' comments and proximity to rail stations all firmly suggest parking is largely by commuters.

30. What is the application criteria for a PSPO around schools and what are the viable alternatives to PSPOs?

Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPO) proposes to deal with a particular nuisance in a particular area that is having a detrimental effect on the quality of life for those in the local community. A PSPO can last no longer than 3 years and is not specifically targeted at managing parking.

Other options around schools which are actively being considered i.e. School Streets, pedestrian areas, CPZs etc. These all require significant investment and ongoing enforcement.

31. Given that all new parking schemes have to be approved by ward councillors, what involvement will they have to any changes in their ward?

There is no democratic process that requires parking schemes to be approved by ward councillors. However, good practice has been to encourage consultation with local ward councillors. The Cabinet Member for the Environment is the arbiter of any scheme to be implemented under the current democratic process.

The introduction of any proposed CPZs will be subject to statutory consultation with all those affected residents, business and ward councillors to ensure their views are considered at the early design stage.

### Highways Resurfacing Policy

- a) The report fails to demonstrate that the worst first roads and pavements have been determined when no account is taken of reactive repairs spend, advice from Area Liaison Officers who regularly inspect our streets, information from the CRM system, Ward Councillor views, complaints, insurance claims, footfall etc.

The proposed highways policy approach is to prioritise the worst roads and pavements first, addressing a backlog in surfacing work and making a real step change in the condition of our network based on UKPMS survey data.

- b) The financial implications for the Highways Resurfacing Policy fail to demonstrate indicative projections for raising increased revenue to service borrowing and the timescales envisaged from the implementation of the proposals.

Highways' resurfacing is not a revenue producing activity.

- c) There is a lack of detail on the capital and revenue costs resulting from the application of the Horizon system.

The Horizon system capital costs were circa £30k.

- d) Greater clarity needs to be demonstrated in the method of selecting priorities Of the highways and footways to be repaired, particularly where a number of such highways and footways are in a similar condition.

The Highways resurfacing policy states the methodology used is worst first based on UKPMS survey data.

Cllr Keith Darvill

Cllr Ray  
Morgon

Cllr Clarence Barrett