

## **PARKING STRATEGY UPDATE**

### **Report of the Executive Director of Place**

#### **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Council placed a moratorium on the introduction of any new resident parking schemes in 2019 to enable a full review of the existing approach to be taken. This review was required as elements of the existing policy were not working effectively and were not meeting the needs of residents. There were also concerns relating to the impact of schemes on local services and the town and district centres. In order to ensure a coordinated approach, it was agreed that all policies and procedures relating to residents parking, including the Town Centre, would be reviewed.
- 1.2 The Council's approach to parking sits at the intersection of a number of competing agendas including responding to the climate emergency, promoting health, wellbeing and active travel, and promoting economic growth. It has become evident through the review process that any parking policies need to navigate between these sometimes competing priorities whilst also accounting for the expectations of residents, businesses and visitors to Stockport, and managing the impacts of population growth and demographic change.
- 1.3 As part of the ongoing work to develop the Local Plan, there is a need to consider the Council's future approach to parking in planning policy terms, but also a number of current operational issues relating to residents parking and parking in the town centre which resulted in the ongoing moratorium. It is vital that there is consistency between planning and operational policies, and an overall coordinated approach which supports the Council's wider strategic objectives
- 1.4 The proposed policies within this report relate to residents parking in Stockport town centre and the rest of borough it does not cover special events parking which will be reviewed separately. In recent years there has been a growing number of concerts, festivals and fairs across the borough as well as sporting events which impact on local neighbourhoods.
- 1.5 The impacts of Covid-19 on how we travel, and subsequent parking requirements are not yet known but there is an opportunity to utilise the Covid-19 recovery principles of 'Build Back Better' to frame an updated approach to parking.
- 1.6 In light of the above, the purpose of this paper is to seek approval for the revised policy based upon feedback from Scrutiny and Area Committees.
- 1.7 Further detail on the rationale and proposed changes to resident parking policy can be found in Appendix 2

- 1.8 Further detail on the rationale and proposed changes to town centre residential parking policy can be found in Appendix 3

## 2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Parking covers a far wider scope than just conventional car parking in Council-owned car parks. It also relates to broader areas including residential parking, parking in the town centre, parking in district and local centres, on and off-street parking, disabled parking, parking and charging for electric vehicles, car club parking, cycle parking, lorry and coach parking.

- 2.2 Delivery of a coordinated approach to parking in its broadest sense is complex and requires careful management against the Council's overarching strategic priorities. There are a number of key challenges which have to be managed, including:

- The need to balance demand for parking with encouraging active travel and public transport use
- The need to provide adequate space for car parking in areas where space is often at a premium whilst maximising the space available for other uses
- The need to balance between generating income from parking charges and using charging to encourage behaviour change, and facilitating business activity and economic growth
- The need to provide parking in a flexible way to respond to different users (e.g. visitors and commuters) whilst managing the impact of parking and parking overspill on local communities
- The need to provide parking in a way which enables provision to respond to longer term demographic trends (e.g. reduced car ownership amongst younger generations) and changes in the way we travel (e.g. growth of autonomous vehicles).

- 2.3 In order to manage these challenges, a series of proposed principles to guide policy development in relation to parking have been identified. These have been set out against the covid-19 recovery principles of 'Build Back Better'.

| Build Back Better Theme | Overarching Principles to guide policymaking  |
|-------------------------|---|
| Greener                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Support the provision of alternative transport to reduce need for private car ownership, especially in town and district centres.</li></ul> |

|        |   |
|--------|---|
|        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the provision of cycle storage for all types of journeys and users.</li> <li>• Support the provision of fuelling opportunities for no and low emission vehicles</li> <li>• Ensure fees and charging are used to promote more sustainable travel.</li> </ul>  |
| Fairer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that parking is shared and placed in consolidated locations to free up space for other uses where possible</li> <li>• Ensure disabled parking is provided in line with need.</li> <li>• Ensure charges make a greater contribution to the administration costs of any policies</li> </ul>   |
| Faster | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage the utilisation of electronic permits, tickets, and payments to make the service more efficient.</li> <li>• Ensure that the ability to enforce controls on anti-social parking is improved and maintained.</li> <li>• Reinvigorate behavioural change messaging about parking to encourage people to use alternative modes of transport where possible and where appropriate.</li> </ul> |

### 3. IDENTIFYING PRIORITIES

- 3.1. There is expected to be some pent-up demand for resident parking schemes once the moratorium ends. As officer capacity is limited and there remains other demands upon their time, a fair approach to prioritisation will mean that officers can deliver schemes across the borough and will work with each Area Committee to identify priorities but are likely to be able to bring forward one scheme per Area per year unless other activities are reduced.
- 3.2. Council officers will work up initial consultation materials from central budgets to assess whether there is the necessary local support for a scheme. That information will then be brought to Area Committee for members to review.
- 3.3. Should members wish to proceed to the detailed design, wards will be asked to contribute to progress schemes. Where a zonal scheme is to move to the formal design and consultation phase Ward Members will be asked to contribute £6,000 from their discretionary budget. When a single street or part of street is to progress, wards will be asked to contribute £4,000.
- 3.4. Officers are aware that there are twenty schemes that have been formally requested during the period of the moratorium and these schemes will be

prioritised for delivery once area committees have confirmed that they will contribute to the cost of the scheme development as identified in 3.2.

- 3.5. Of this twenty there are four that will be suitable to be incorporated in to a zonal approach. Seven schemes have been deemed to not meet the requirements of the proposed policy for putting a scheme in place at this time. Nine schemes still need further investigation to establish if they meet the criteria and if they should be dealt with in a zone or as an individual street.
- 3.6. Officers will discuss the specific schemes with local members at area committees following the establishment of the policy.

#### **4. NEXT STEPS**

- 4.1. The principles in section 2 have been identified to try and help guide future parking policy decisions by setting out the core features which will ensure that parking policies align with wider Council objectives, particularly in relation to the Climate Action Now strategy.
- 4.2. In line with these principles and following a review of the existing policies as set out in the current moratorium, a series of proposed amendments to parking policies in line with these principles have been set out in Appendices 1 and 2.

#### **5. COSTS**

- 5.1. The existing permits cost are stated below however there was concern this is no longer reflective of the cost of a scheme.
- Resident permits are currently charged at a fee of £31.
  - Visitor permits are currently charged at a fee of £32.37.
  - The visitor permit cost for residents in possession of a Leisure Key Band A is £16.19.
- 5.2. Following comments on the costing information in the report to Area Committees and Scrutiny further work has been undertaken with charges based on a larger zonal scheme assuming it held 250 households. Design and traffic order costs are not to be recovered from the permits. The estimated recoverable costs are:
- Installation of signs and road markings - £5,000 = £2 per year for maintenance every 10 years<sup>1</sup>
  - Enforcement - £18.94 per household
  - Administration of permit (processing, checking details, producing and delivering) - £20.69

---

<sup>1</sup> • Assuming that, we need to provide new road markings and signs every 10 years, then £5,000 equates to £2 per year per household

- 5.3. If the council does not seek to recover the upfront costs of design etc, a resident parking scheme costs the council approximately £41.63 per permit annually, assuming that each house has an average of one permit. It is recommended that both resident's and visitor's permits (where available) should be charged at £41.50. Currently Leisure Key Band A holders receive a 50% discount on visitor permits. These would therefore be £20.75 for these residents. The scratch cards for individual visitor day permits will be discontinued from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022 although residents will be able to use up existing cards. This will allow residents to purchase a visitor's permit when they renew their permit.
- 5.4. There is one free resident's permit (not visitor's permit), per household for a Blue Badge holder and evidence must be provided that the resident is the registered keeper of the vehicle.
- 5.5. It is suggested that the Medical and Carer Permits due to the lack of a guarantee of space on the street and their expected lower usage should be charged at £20.00. This would cover the bulk of the administration costs.
- 5.6. In some areas permits may be available for businesses and these will be charged at £100 per business permit but this would not show a number plate just the business name allowing a more flexible usage.
- 5.7. Councillors will be able to purchase a permit covering all RPZ in their wards, to allow for them carrying out of their responsibilities. Executive Members will be able to purchase a permit which will allow them to park in any RPZ in the borough. This permit will be the same cost as those for members of the public.

## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1. It is recommended that Cabinet review, comment on and approve:
- the revised principles to guide future parking policy decisions
  - the proposed methods for demand management for parking schemes.
  - the proposal to move all free schemes to paid for schemes as and when maintenance work takes place, but this approach will be kept under review with the Cabinet Member.
  - the proposal to charge for a permit as identified in paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3 of the report and to review the costs annually as part of the Council Fees and Charges Report.
  - That the proposed charges start to be applied from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 and increase annually by inflationary costs
  - the proposed changes to residents parking policy (Appendix 2) to reflect the revised principle.
  - the proposed changes to town centre parking policy (Appendix 3) to reflect the revised principles.

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

There are none

Anyone wishing to inspect the above background papers or requiring further information should contact Mark Glynn, Director of Place Management on telephone number 0161 474 3700 or alternatively email [mark.glynn@stockport.gov.uk](mailto:mark.glynn@stockport.gov.uk)

DRAFT

## Appendix 1 - COMMENTS FORM AREA COMMITTEES AND SCRUTINY

The draft policies were discussed at Scrutiny and Area Committees and a number of comments were received. These comments have been reviewed and the policies amended. The following table provides a detailed explanation of the comments and changes.

The following changes have been made to appendices 2 and 3 in response to Cllr Comments.

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| Cllrs from Heald Green expressed concern that the blue badge arrangements are zonal rather than address specific. They recommended an annual system with council tax. We currently write every year to ask if still eligible for CT discount. | <p>The Blue Badge arrangements in the document for residential areas refer to the free provision of permits for these holders. Blue badge holders have the ability to apply for the placement of a residential parking bay near their property. These, while not dedicated to that user, are to increase the ability for these residents to park. However, although acknowledged in the policy as being possible this is not dealt with in detail in the policy. A further review of the details regarding the placement of blue badges is to be done separately. Therefore, no amendments to the current report are recommended.</p> <p>Within the Town Centre there is a need to provide an appropriate level of parking for the disabled that meets the needs of the disabled residents and visitors. The current process for the provision of disabled bays for new developments is not suitable for the increased level of flats that are being built in the Town Centre. More detailed work is required regarding the placement of bays to make certain that all areas of the town centre are adequately served without the cost of continually placing and removing bays in this area. Therefore, no amendments to the current report are recommended.</p> |
| Can we remove the words potential and if appropriate from cycling facilities in 4.5 of appendix 1? None of the other options have these caveats.  | <p>The proposed change will be made to appendix 1 paragraph 4.5:</p> <p><i>“4.5. Options will include but not be limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>• Residents only parking at all times</i></li><li><i>• Residents only parking only between certain hours</i></li><li><i>• Short stay Pay and Display parking for non-residents using local facilities in the</i></li></ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loading bays at certain periods in the day in the zone</li> <li>• Long stay commuter Pay and Display parking in appropriate locations and times in the zone.</li> <li>• Public electric vehicle charging bays in the zone</li> <li>• Blue badge bays (mandatory or advisory)</li> <li>• Car Club Bays in the zone</li> <li>• Secure cycle parking options.</li> <li>• Implementing other signage and lining to deter antisocial parking”</li> </ul>   |
| Can we add give carers to the list of exempt professions? | <p>The following list will be amended to include professional carers in appendix 2 and 3.</p> <p><i>“4.17. The following professions are eligible for a medical and carers permit to use while carrying out their job:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Arts Therapist</i></li> <li><i>Chiropodist</i></li> <li><i>Coroners Officers</i></li> <li><i>Dietician</i></li> <li><i>Doctor</i></li> <li><i>Midwife</i></li> <li><i>Nurse</i></li> <li><i>Occupational Therapist</i></li> <li><i>Orthoptist</i></li> <li><i>Prosthetist</i></li> <li><i>Orthotist</i></li> <li><i>Paramedic</i></li> <li><i>Podiatrist</i></li> <li><i>Physiotherapist</i></li> <li><i>Physical Therapist</i></li> <li><i>Registered Social Worker</i></li> <li><i>Speech Therapist</i></li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <i>Professional Care Staff</i>   |
| Cllr from Cheadle and Gatley requested a breakdown of the costs.   | The cost information in the Appendix A of the reports was to guide discussion on future decisions about the necessary charges that will be applied to reflect the overall interests of the borough. It is recognised that furthermore detailed work will be needed to identify a final charge for the permits. It is considered best to deliver changes to costs in the Council's Fees and Charges annual report. The placement of this pricing work in the fees and charges review will also mean that it can be regularly monitored to make sure that pricing continues to be fair and also supports the costs of the schemes.   |
| Cllr from Cheadle Hulme North requested that a link be made to the pavement parking review.  | In order to reflect the ongoing national review of pavement parking the following amendment it proposed in 3.1 of appendix 1 and 2.<br><i>"Behavioural change messages discouraging anti-social parking should form part of all parking solutions. This would include: blocking driveways, not leaving room for passing vehicles or pedestrians when parked, parking too close to or on junctions and blocking dropped crossings. Once the ongoing national pavement parking review has been completed the Council will seek to use the amended controls available to prevent antisocial parking."</i>   |
| <p>Cllr from Marple North identified a range of issues around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• anti-social parking</li> <li>• the lack of radical change to policy</li> <li>• lack of detailed costing information</li> <li>• car clubs</li> <li>• process of developing zones</li> <li>• enforcement and maintenance,</li> <li>• vote counting</li> <li>• public objections</li> <li>• criteria for zones</li> <li>• application process for permits,</li> </ul> | <p><u>ANTI-SOCIAL PARKING</u> -The collective application of all of the suggestions together in 2.3 are expected to deliver the improvement to the issues around antisocial parking and related behaviour. The issue is also specifically addressed in both of the appendices in the principles for the policy.</p> <p><u>LACK OF RADICAL POLICY CHANGE</u> - More radical options have been considered during the review, however, the overall decision was to provide a policy that gave more flexibility in what was delivered in an area to improve the problems it faced. This could result in more restrictions in some cases for residents but only where the area study shows that this could be overall of benefit to an area.</p> <p><u>CAR CLUBS AS PART OF WIDER OPTIONS IN THE REPORT</u> - Car clubs</p> |

- pricing
- use of off-street carparks.

would be those that could be put in place for use by residents. There have been a number of developers who have expressed an interest in putting them in place as part of the transport provision for their new residential builds where parking is limited. We have also been approached by some resident groups for the council to provide places for them in their residential areas. Most recently a group in the Heatons. The lack of car clubs in Stockport residential areas is something that we expected to change and so are seeking to make provision for in the policy.

ENFORCEMENT AND MAINTENANCE -The process for this is not proposed to change. The finer details of maintenance and enforcement should be addressed by improved process in 4.22 regarding information passing to the parking team after development.

VOTING COUNT PROCEDURE The policy will amend this to a percentage of those who vote with this being made clear on the response forms. Non-votes will be considered as being neither for nor against the implementation of the zone.

COUNCILOR INFLUENCE – One area of feedback from the public is that there is a need to be seen to be able to appeal councillor decisions. The public's ability to appeal does not mean that the decision in question needs to be amended. The process of approving by Committee does not preclude working with Cllrs before this point to develop a scheme that meets the needs of the area.

CONSULTATION WITH THE PUBLIC – the development of schemes involves consultation at several points:

- Initial request for scheme by petition to identify a likely interest in the scheme where no scheme exists.
- Vote by current permit holders is undertaken to identify if a non-paid scheme will be moved to a paid scheme or removed. A majority vote is considered necessary for move to paid

schemes.

- Once the initial request or vote has resulted in scheme development progressing and the proposed option developed then a consultation is undertaken to gain support for the proposed scheme. These comments feed in to the report to area committee to approve the final scheme. This is similar to other transport schemes that the Council undertakes.
- TROs are necessary for these schemes. TROs have a required element of public comment and advertisement. Any objections to TROs have to be considered. This is part of the legal process.

The process of consultation gains public support for the schemes as well as giving opportunities to change the scheme before the legal process of the TROs, giving a greater likelihood that an objection at the point can be successfully dealt with.

PARKING CRITERIA AND AREA AUDIT - These are existing criteria used to provide Councillors with clear recommendations to enable them to make an informed decision. This process will be even more important to the process if the options for the scheme are wider as described in 4.5.

PROCESS OF APPLICATION FOR PERMIT - The information for Council Tax and other Council services is not available to the process for parking permits as GDPR does not allow for this. The Parking Team do try to assist members of public who struggle to provide paperwork and they are working to limit the need for repeat permit applications. However, for initial applications, the full process is required to minimise the abuse of residents permits by none residents.

FREE COUNCILLOR PERMITS - Due to the issues raised in meetings this has been removed in favour of identifying them as being allowed to purchase such a permit

OFF STREET PARKING USE - This is a potential option as stated in 4.5. The policy will look at all options for the area in consideration, including options not listed so the maintenance or enactment of schemes using off road parking is still there.

ADDITION OF BUSINESS USERS – It is proposed that the policy is amended at 4.5 to specifically include local businesses and organisations:

*4.5. Options will include but not be limited to:*

- *Residents only parking at all times*
- *Residents only parking only between certain hours*
- *Permits for local businesses and organisations within the zone*
- *Short stay Pay and Display parking for non-residents using local facilities in the zone.*
- *Loading bays at certain periods in the day in the zone*
- *Long stay commuter Pay and Display parking in appropriate locations and times in the zone.*
- *Public electric vehicle charging bays in the zone*
- *Blue badge bays (mandatory or advisory)*
- *Car Club Bays in the zone*
- *Secure cycle parking options*
- *Implementing other signage and lining to deter antisocial parking”*

DEMAND MANAGEMENT – it is recognised that there has been a large demand for the implementation of residential zones and that this puts a strain on Council resources and a process for demand management is needed. Demand management would also enable the minimisation of any cost to area committees for initial surveys.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Cllr from Bramall and Cale Green requested the use of ANPR cameras for enforcement of Council car parking   | Enforcement changes have not been addressed in this report. The opinion of the Parking Team earlier this year was that we as a local authority could not use ANPR but they will be asked to investigate this again.  |
| Cllr from Edgeley and Cheadle Health requested: the number of vehicles that had access to off street parking; and the breakdown of residents parking by ward. | <p>The Council has no figures to enable us to breakdown the number of cars in the borough with off road parking so unfortunately this cannot be provided</p> <p>The streets or part streets<sup>2</sup> that are included in a residents parking scheme are split as follows over Area Committees:</p> <p>Bramhall and Cheadle Hulme South - 17</p> <p>Cheadle – 24</p> <p>Heatons and Reddish – 29</p> <p>Marple – 24</p> <p>Stepping Hill – 47</p> <p>Stockport Central – 140</p> <p>Werneth - 20</p>  |
| Cllr from Davenport and Cale Green: Does not want free passes for councillors   | FREE COUNCILLOR PERMITS - Due to the issues raised in meetings this was removed in favour of identifying them as being allowed to purchase such a permit   |
| Cllr from Heatons South questioned: Who would consider the options for the schemes; had concern about costs to residents and costs to ward budgets            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consideration of scheme options would include officers and members as currently to achieve the best option.</li> <li>• The cost information in the Appendix A of the reports is to guide discussion on future decisions about the necessary charges that will be applied to reflect the overall interests of the borough. It is recognised that furthermore detailed work will be needed to identify a final charge for the permits. As proposed in the paper it is considered best to deliver changes to costs in the Council's Fees and Charges annual report. The placement of this pricing work in the fees and charges review will also mean that it can be regularly monitored to make sure that pricing</li> </ul> |

<sup>2</sup> These streets will not necessarily be their own separate scheme but could have been brought in as parking Zones.

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>continues to be fair and also supports the costs of the schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ward budget are the current mechanism to cover the cost of initial work for the installation of a scheme. The need to consider the flow of demand and the minimisation of the impact on these budgets has been considered in the report in Demand Management.</li></ul> |
|--|---|

DRAFT

