

REPORT FROM: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES MANAGER

TO: NELSON COMMITTEE

DATE: 3 JULY 2017

Report Author: Sandra Farnell
Tel. No: 01282 661053
E-mail: sandra.farnell@pendle.gov.uk

**PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF A RESIDENTS-ONLY PARKING SCHEME:
ALBERT STREET, NELSON**

PURPOSE OF REPORT

Following a request from residents of 3–35 and 2–36 Albert Street in Nelson, it was resolved on 6 February 2017 that the Neighbourhood Services Manager be requested to undertake a survey for the possible introduction of a residents-only parking scheme and to report back to this Committee on the outcome of the survey..

RECOMMENDATION

- (1) That although the traffic surveys demonstrated that parking is at capacity on Albert Street, the results of the survey provided no overwhelming majority in favour of the introduction of a residents' parking scheme and therefore a scheme should not be introduced for the residents of Albert Street.
- (2) That members note that the issues with regard to the request for one-way traffic on Albert Street has been passed to Lancashire County Council (Highways).

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) The survey results do not provide evidence to support the introduction of a scheme.
- (2) For further consideration to be given to the movement of traffic on Albert Street.

BACKGROUND

1. Following a request by residents to Councillor N Ahmed that consideration be given to the introduction of a residents-only parking scheme for 3–35 and 2–36 Albert Street, it was resolved at this Committee on 6 February 2017 that the Neighbourhood Services Manager be requested to undertake a survey for the possible introduction of a residents-only parking scheme and to report back to on the outcome of the survey. Numbers 42–62 Albert Street and 115, 117, 119, 126 and 128 Every Street Nelson were also included in the proposed scheme.

ISSUE

2. A resident's questionnaire regarding the possibility of introducing residents-only parking was sent to the residents and a parking duration survey was undertaken in March 2017.
3. A plan showing the area surveyed and the extent of the proposed residents' parking bays can be found in Appendix 1.
4. A full copy of the eligibility criteria for residents only parking as set down by Lancashire County Council (LCC) can be found in Appendix 2.
5. LCC will only support residents-only parking where the district authority can clearly show a high level of available kerb space is occupied for more than six hours between 8am and 6pm on five or more days in a week. LCC also requires that the proposal should be acceptable to the greater proportion of the residents. A 75 per cent response rate from households, with more than 50 per cent of these being in favour of the scheme, is considered acceptable.
6. Detailed results of the parking duration survey are available on request.

SURVEY RESULTS

7. Due to there being a perceived lower number of properties interested in residents-only parking at Nos 42–62, I have separated the questionnaire survey results into two areas below.
8. We indicated clearly on the questionnaire that it would be assumed that a non-returned form meant that the resident did not want residents-only parking introduced.

All Properties

9. A total of 39 residential properties were surveyed, with 23 replies.

In favour of providing the scheme..... 21 (54 per cent of total properties surveyed)
Against providing the scheme..... 2 (5 per cent of total properties surveyed)
No reply 16 (41 per cent of total properties surveyed)

Properties Numbered 3–35 and 2–36

10. In this area, 25 residential properties which would be entitled to a permit were surveyed, with 13 replies.

In favour of providing the scheme..... 13 (52 per cent of total properties surveyed)
Against providing the scheme..... 0 (0 per cent of total properties surveyed)
No reply 12 (48 per cent of total properties surveyed)

ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY RESULTS

11. Both sets of results of the questionnaire indicate that there is no strong desire for the introduction of the scheme, with only 54 per cent (21) and 52 per cent (13) of the residents responding positively to the survey.
12. One comment was received from a resident in favour of the scheme which seemed to focus around issues with parking from town centre workers during the working week.

13. A small number of residents asked that Albert Street be made one-way. This matter has been referred to Lancashire County Council Highways as a separate issue.

PARKING DURATION SURVEY

14. There was no significant issue with parking outside numbers 42–62 during the week or at the weekend. Taking this into account together with the 54 per cent response rate to the questionnaire, the remaining results of this report will focus on properties numbered 3–35 and 2–36.

Survey Results for Properties Numbered 3–35 and 2–36

15. The table below indicates the percentage of parking space taken on each of the visits (capacity) and of these vehicles what percentage belonged to residents (shaded). It should be noted that all visits were conducted three times per day during the working week and weekend.

Date		Morning	Noon	Evening
		%	%	%
Mon	Capacity	100	89	75
	Residential	50	40	33
Tue	Capacity	104	118	75
	Residential	59	45	33
Wed	Capacity	118	104	111
	Residential	45	41	32
Thur	Capacity	118	107	104
	Residential	45	37	38
Fri	Capacity	107	110	100
	Residential	40	39	39
Sat	Capacity	104	104	104
	Residential	83	76	62
Sun	Capacity	82	71	71
	Residential	40	39	39

16. The maximum capacity available within a suggested permit parking bay (see plan in Appendix 1) is 28 vehicles.
17. During the week the maximum number of vehicles parked on Albert Street at any one time equated to 118 per cent capacity, and of those vehicles 45 per cent were residential. On the majority of occasions, the capacity was between 80 and 104 per cent, and of those, half were residential vehicles.
18. In general, a parking pattern emerged of residential vehicles parking in similar places on the street. On the whole, there was not much variance to this pattern which would indicate that residents, at least during the time of the survey, did manage to park outside or near to their home.
19. On several occasions, officers saw evidence of vehicles meeting head on with nowhere to pass due to parking on both sides of the street. As the parking was at capacity, this resulted in vehicles having to reverse down the whole of Albert Street to Every Street.

CONCLUSIONS

20. There is insufficient strength of feeling from the questionnaires results to introduce a scheme.
21. Although the traffic survey confirmed that parking is at a premium on Albert Street, there is insufficient evidence that non-residential vehicles are causing a problem regularly for more than six hours per day.
22. The survey demonstrates that on the majority of occasions, residential vehicles on both sides of the street could find a parking space either outside or near to their property. Visitors to these same properties may have had to park further away but there was still more than 33 per cent available kerbside parking on the bottom section of Albert Street (property number 42–62).
23. In addition, formalising the parking for residents would decrease the amount of available parking space (within the residents' parking area), and could in fact increase the problems that residents are currently experiencing from multiple vehicle ownership on the street.
24. It is therefore recommended that a residents-only parking scheme is not introduced to Albert Street.
25. A small number of residents asked that Albert Street be made one-way. Officers also witnessed problems with traffic not being able to travel up and down Albert Street. This matter has been referred to Lancashire County Council Highways as a separate issue.

IMPLICATIONS

Policy: None arising directly from this report.

Financial: None arising directly from this report.

Legal: In order to enforce a residents-only parking scheme, a Traffic Regulation Order would have to be made. This would be done by Lancashire County Council once full approval was given by them.

Risk Management: None arising directly from this report.

Health and Safety: None arising directly from this report.

Sustainability: None arising directly from this report.

Community Safety: None arising directly from this report.

Equality and Diversity: None arising directly from this report.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Residents-Only Parking Area Plan.
Appendix 2: LCC Criteria.

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.



Criteria for Residential Parking Permit Schemes

1. Not less than 67 per cent of the available kerb space should be occupied for more than six hours between 8.00am and 6.00pm on five or more days in a week from Monday to Saturday and a bona fide need of the residents should be established.

Note: "Available kerb space" is defined as the length of unrestricted carriageway where parking could be permitted. This would of course exclude junctions, accesses and areas subject to existing waiting restrictions (but not limited waiting).

2. Not more than 50 per cent of the car-owning residents have or could make parking available within the curtilage of their property, or within 200 metres (walking distance) of that property in the form of rented space or garages, etc. Off-street parking space should not be available within 200 metres walking distance.

Note: Off-street car parks are considered as an available facility for local residents but not where an hourly/daily charge is made (eg pay and display) unless contract arrangements or similar have been provided.

3. The peak or normal working day demand for residents' spaces should be able to be met.

Note: The parking problem or peak demand time may be outside the normal working day, eg next to a shift-working factory or hospital, and this should be taken into consideration.

4. When considering the introduction of concessions for residents within an existing restricted area, the re-introduction of a limited number of parked vehicles should not negate the original reasons for introducing the restrictions.
5. The police should be satisfied that a reasonable level of enforcement of the proposals can be maintained, or alternatively that enforcement could be adequately carried out by some alternative means.
6. The proposals should be acceptable to the greater proportion of the residents. A 75 per cent response rate from households, with greater than 50 per cent of these being in favour of the scheme, is considered acceptable.
7. The introduction of the scheme should not be likely to cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.
8. Permits for non-residential premises should be able to be limited in their issue to essential operational use only.