**Sustainable Development, Planning and Transport Committee -**

1. **JUNE 2017**

**PART I - DELEGATED**

**6. PARKING BAY PROGRAMME**

(DCES)

1. **Summary**

1.1 This report provides the current, prioritised list of proposed schemes to increase parking opportunities by converting grassed verges and other areas. It details the schemes that have been introduced over the last financial year and which are expected to be introduced in the next year. The committee is also asked to modify the criteria used to prioritise the request list.

2. **Details**

 **Background**

* 1. The Council implements an annual programme to convert grassed areas to parking bays, in areas experiencing parking congestion. 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.
	2. These areas include the grassed areas on the verge of public roads, on land owned by the District Council or on land owned by other public bodies such as Housing Associations. Some schemes are progressed jointly with the Local Highway Authority, Hertfordshire County Council ‘(the LHA’). Some consents may be required such as planning or highways consents, or agreements with land owners.
	3. Where consents are required this can substantially increase the cost and delivery timescales for schemes. For example, the administrative fee to process a recent Highways consent to create a layby was just under £5,000. As a result there are efficiencies in progressing schemes jointly with the LHA.
	4. The original budget for 2017/18 was £40,000. This is supplemented by a re-phased amount of £72,000, giving a latest budget for the year of £112,000. There are two schemes proposed to be delivered this year have been costed at around £82,000, with a third estimated at £30,000 depending on scope.

**Schemes delivered recently**

* 1. Schemes in five locations were implemented in 2016/17 including three that had been developed over several years since the last schemes that were implemented in 2013/14. Of these schemes, three were located on District Council land and two were located on highway verge. These schemes were implemented in two phases; those described as ‘Phase 1’ below had been prepared from 2014 to 2016. Those described as ‘Phase 2’ were prepared in 2016 by the District Council working with the LHA (as a joint ‘Locality’ scheme for the local County Councillor).
	2. These schemes, delivered at a total expenditure of £70,950, have created new parking areas in five locations including:

Phase 1

* Six bays at Ashridge Drive, South Oxhey
* Four bays opposite 22-40 Woodhall Lane, South Oxhey
* Six bays at Luffenham House, Fairfield Avenue, South Oxhey

Phase 2

* 16 bays at Woodhall Lane, South Oxhey (joint LHA scheme, outside 36-42 & opposite 44-50)
* 14 bays at Ganton Walk, South Oxhey (joint LHA scheme)

 **Schemes prepared for delivery in 2017/18**

* 1. The prioritised request list is shown at Appendix A. Two further schemes in Abbots Langley have been prepared in 2016/17 for potential delivery this year (subject to consents), based on their priority and local opportunity.
	2. These are in Abbots Langley at School Mead (requested by the local Residents’ Association) and South Way; and in South Oxhey at Barnhurst Path.
	3. In School Mead, the proposal would convert existing parallel parking adjacent to grassed areas to echelon bays to create around 15 new parking spaces at a cost estimated at £47,000. This would address a serious and consistent problem with parking pressure at this popular local centre and shopping parade.
	4. On South Way, the proposal would convert existing grassed area to permeable grasscrete to provide between 30-40 new parking bays at an estimated cost of £ 35,000. This is contingent on LHA approval and is important to enable resident parking that allows bus passage, particularly following the introduction of the South Way Cycle Way which uses this heavily-parked access road.
	5. On Barnhurst Path, proposals are being developed to convert part of a 200-metre section of grassed verge to hardened parking areas, probably grasscrete. This is a typical South Oxhey residential street where the grassed area is owned by the District Council and the grass is already heavily parked in some places. Costs are estimated at £30,000.

 **Parking Bay Prioritisation Procedure**

* 1. The Parking Bay Prioritisation Procedure was agreed by the Sustainable Development, Planning and Transport Committee in November 2014 and is described below.
	2. The programme is 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 the 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 |

* 1. The decision of the November 2014 meeting of this committee included a requirement that these criteria should be regularly reviewed. Since then, officers have found that Criterion ‘F’ has been very difficult to assess, so no scheme has been subjected to this assessment because the criterion is so subjective; the measurement of ‘alternative off-street parking’ is not defined and it is difficult to justify any particular definition.
	2. Private parking capacity is not usually employed in consideration of public parking provision because it is so difficult to measure and because it fluctuates according to private decisions. For example, a count of numbers of garages cannot show whether these are used or useable for parking; or if these have been converted to habitable rooms.
	3. It is also difficult to compare driveways in different streets as it is not clear how to consider the many that are not legal accesses, or how to compare driveways of different sizes or private land currently used as informal parking. It is therefore difficult to use these as a measure of the private parking opportunity
	4. It is recommended that this criterion is removed from the process. If the committee requires that the lack of parking availability is taken into consideration, it is recommended that this includes only on-street parking, which is more easily measureable and clearly defined.
	5. It is also recommended that a criterion is included allowing a score of up to 3 for scheme deliverability (to be allocated based on factors such as opportunities for reduced consents or additional funding).

**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 are 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. Some schemes have been delivered because they are more easily deliverable, for example where there is joint funding available in that year.

|  |
| --- |
| **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 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.

5. **Financial Implications**

5.1The Council approved the capital budgets for 2017/18 and the parking bay schemes will be managed within this agreed allocation.

6. **Legal Implications**

6.1 The Council undertakes works on the highways in agreement with guidelines set by County Council. Section 278 agreements with the LHA are entered into where appropriate. The District Council is also investigating revised agency agreements to enable these minor works to be carried out without the need for costly legal agreements.

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**

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 Traffic Engineer.

9. **Environmental Implications**

9.1 Parking schemes are part of the Council’s sustainable transport objectives, contributing towards a visually enhanced street scene and supporting bus and cycle access on heavily parked streets, to help reduce car dependency and CO2 emissions. Where possible, schemes are designed to fit into local street scenes and to retain trees and other features that provide improved quality of life standards to the public.

9.2 The impact of schemes on the local built environment and street scheme will be considered as part of individual schemes. Schemes built recently have been redesigned to retain street trees.

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 risks 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. a) That the request prioritisation for parking bays 2017/18, shown in Appendix A, is noted and progress approved, leading to consents and delivery of schemes, with detailed decisions delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Lead Member for Housing, Planning and Strategic Schemes.

b) That criterion F is removed from the prioritisation procedure as set out in section 2.18 above.

c) That additional criteria are included to take account of the opportunities for deliverability that become available, as set out in section 2.19 above.

 Report prepared by: Peter Simons, Traffic Engineer, Regulatory Services

 (on behalf of Tracy Langley, Property Services)

 **APPENDICES / ATTACHMENTS**

 **App A - Request Prioritisation 2017-18**

 **App B – Completed scheme images**