**Sustainable Development, Planning and Transport Committee**

* **21 JUNE 2016**

**PART I - DELEGATED**

**5. PARKING BAY PROGRAMME**

(DCES)

1. **Summary**

1.1 To publish the up to date list of proposed schemes in their current status.

2. **Details**

**Background**

* 1. The Council implements an annual programme of new parking bays in areas experiencing parking congestion. Some schemes can be implemented without the need for planning consent, but others, for example on bus routes, require planning permission which inevitably lengthens the process for implementation. The budget for 2016/17 is £40,000 which comprises the programme and consultant costs to drive the schemes through the planning process.
  2. Schemes are generally requested by residents who find it difficult to park near their own home where parking is inadequate due to limited off road parking or because a large proportion of spaces are taken up by other road users.
  3. For the past couple of years no schemes have been implemented.
  4. In June 2016 three schemes have been confirmed to start before the end of this month:
* Ashridge Drive, South Oxhey
* Opposite 22-40 Woodhall Lane, South Oxhey
* Luffenham House, Fairfield Avenue, South Oxhey

2.5 The £40,000 annual budget will be depleted just to pay for these three schemes alone but it is believed that a rephasing of previous capital not spent of £103,000 will aid in the delivery of many more this year when further schemes have planning approved according to prioritisation.

**Parking Bay Prioritisation Procedure reminder**

* 1. The Parking Bay Prioritisation Procedure is set out in items 2.6 to 2.9 and Tables 1 & 2 Below.
  2. The programme will be agreed annually with the Sustainable Development, Planning and Transport Committee and will comprise:
* The completion of projects that are already under way
* A selection, agreed by Councillors, from highest scoring requests to ensure a balanced programme with due regard for available resources
  1. Once the programme has been set it shall be adhered to with significant additions being limited to urgent risk reduction concerns and subject to the Lead Member’s approval.
  2. Requests for parking bay schemes are to be scored according to Table 1 below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: General scoring of requests** | | |
| **Ref.** | **Description** | **Score** |
| A | Request of scheme by each resident including petitions | + up to 5 |
| B | For each Ward Cllr making/supporting the request | + up to 3 |
| C | If a request is made by the Police | +2 |
| D | If a request is made by Hertfordshire County Council, as a result of highway improvements/alterations | +2 |
| E | Adjustment based on Officers' judgement | +/- up to 2 |
| F | There is no alternative off-street parking such as a driveway or garage for a proportion of residents – 50%/ 60%/ more than 70% | +2/+3/+4 |

**Explanation of the Prioritisation Procedure**

* 1. The reasoning behind the scores set out in table 1 above is set out in table 2 below. The numbers assigned to different items are arbitrary, but intended to reflect their relative significances, and could easily be reviewed or revised now, or in future based on experience of the process in practice. It is also intended to give context to the prioritisation criteria to avoid any confusion.
  2. Those schemes with the highest scores will be completed first, however if there are several schemes with matching scores the date the request was received will then determine the order they are completed. Date order will only be used when there are matching scores.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Reasoning behind suggested scores and multipliers** | |
| **General scoring of requests** | |
| **Ref.** | **Reasoning** |
| A | One point for each resident for a scheme request is the simplest method of scoring. The maximum score that can be received is 5 in order to ensure larger residential areas are not given higher weighting priority. Should the request be via a petition from residents the score shall automatically be given the maximum of 5 points. |
| B | To allow Councillors to effectively support residents in cases of particular interest to them, and to allow them to lend more or less support depending on their view. |
| C, D | To ensure greater weight is given to the concerns of expert and responsible bodies than to unqualified members of the public. |
| E | To allow the scoring of items to be weighted by expert opinion (where this discretion is used, it is expected that a justification will be given). |
| F | To ensure that priority is given to schemes to install bays where garage or driveways are not available for the majority of residents. Priority should be given to those who have a need for parking bay provision. |

3. **Options/Reasons for Recommendation**

3.1 The proposals set out above will enable the effective control and progression of the Parking Bay Programme and ensure fairness and transparency with the prioritisation of parking bay scheme requests.

4. **Policy/Budget Reference and Implications**

4.1 The recommendations in this report are within the Council’s agreed policy and budgets. The relevant policies are to provide a safe, healthy and high quality environment and reduce the eco-footprint of the District, and were agreed on 26 February 2013.

5. **Financial Implications**

5.1In February, the Council approved the capital budgets for 2016/17 and the parking bay schemes will be managed within this agreed allocation. Further to this, a proposed re-phasing of previous year’s unspent capital budgets is being recommended to P&R committee on 13 June 2016 amounting to £103,000. At this stage, it is expected that the proposed re-phasing will be agreed,

6. **Legal Implications**

6.1 The Council undertakes works on the highways in agreement with guidelines set by County Council. Section 278 agreements are entered into where appropriate works on the highways proceed.

7. **Equal Opportunities Implications**

7.1 **Relevance Test**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Has a relevance test been completed for Equality Impact? | No |
| Did the relevance test conclude a full impact assessment was required? Matter will be reviewed through on-going consultation. | No |

7.2 **Impact Assessment**

What actions were identified to address any detrimental impact or unmet need?

No detrimental impact or unmet need was identified. If any arises, the issue will be reviewed through continuing consultation on individual schemes.

8. **Staffing Implications**

8.1 Parking schemes are prepared by the Council’s consultant engineer.

9. **Environmental Implications**

9.1 Parking schemes are part of the Council’s sustainable transport objectives, designed to reduce car dependency and CO2 emissions.

9.2 The impact of schemes on the local built environment and street scheme will be considered as part of individual schemes.

10. **Community Safety Implications**

10.1 All schemes are designed to take account of safety implications. Where appropriate a safety audit will be carried out as part of the scheme design.

11. **Customer Services Centre Implications**

11.1 Where required staff will be briefed as appropriate.

12. **Communications and** **Website Implications**

12.1 Information about individual schemes, and the Council’s general approach to parking schemes, will be made available online and at key locations such as libraries and parish offices as appropriate.

13. **Risk Management and Health & Safety Implications**

13.1 The Council has agreed its risk management strategy which can be found on the website at http://www.threerivers.gov.uk. In addition, the risks of the proposals in the report have also been assessed against the Council’s duties under Health and Safety legislation relating to employees, visitors and persons affected by our operations. The risk management implications of this report are detailed below.

13.2 The subject of this report is covered by the Regulatory Service plan. Any risks resulting from this report will be included in the risk register and, if necessary, managed within this plan.

13.3 The following table gives the risks if the recommendations are agreed, together with a scored assessment of their impact and likelihood:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Description of Risk | | Impact | Likelihood |
| 1 | Schemes may not be completed in the order requests were received. | I | E |

13.4 The risks detailed above are already managed within a service plan.

13.5 The above risk are plotted on the matrix below depending on the scored assessments of impact and likelihood, detailed definitions of which are included in the risk management strategy. The Council has determined its aversion to risk and is prepared to tolerate risks where the combination of impact and likelihood are plotted in the shaded area of the matrix. The remaining risks require a treatment plan.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Likelihood** | A |  |  |  |  |  | Impact | Likelihood |
| B |  |  |  |  |  | V = Catastrophic | A = >98% |
| C |  |  |  |  |  | IV = Critical | B = 75% - 97% |
| D |  |  |  |  |  | III = Significant | C = 50% - 74% |
| E | X |  |  |  |  | II = Marginal | D = 25% - 49% |
| F |  |  |  |  |  | I = Negligible | E = 3% - 24% |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V |  | F = <2% |
| **Impact** | | | | | |  |  |

13.6 In the officers’ opinion none of the new risk above, were they to come about, would seriously prejudice the achievement of the Strategic Plan and are therefore operational risks. The effectiveness of treatment plans are reviewed by the Audit Committee annually.

14. **Recommendations**

* 1. That this year’s version of the Parking Bay Programme is approved and the prioritisations of the schemes are calculated leading to prompt planning approval and delivery of schemes.

Report prepared by: Lyn Ware, Interim Head of Property Services

**APPENDICES / ATTACHMENTS**

APPENDIX A – Parking Bay Programme Doc - June 2016