

REPORT FROM: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES MANAGER

TO: NELSON COMMITTEE

DATE: 6 AUGUST 2018

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

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

Following a report to this Committee in July and September 2017 for a request for residents-only parking on Albert Street in Nelson and a further petition for residents-only parking from residents of Mosley Street and Every Street, it was resolved on 6 November 2017 that the Neighbourhood Services Manager be requested to undertake a survey for the possible introduction of a residents-only parking scheme in all three areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) That members be asked to consider whether due to the results of the survey providing a majority in favour of the introduction of a residents-only parking scheme on Albert Street, Every Street and Mosley Street and the traffic surveys indicating evidence to support the introduction of a scheme that a scheme be introduced for the residents.
- (2) That members note the comments made by Lancashire County Council (Highways) via the Traffic Liaison meeting with regard to the request for one-way traffic on Albert Street, Nelson.
- (3) That members may wish to also consider asking Lancashire County Council to introduce double yellow lines near to the junctions of Manchester Road/Albert Street and Manchester Road/Mosley Street.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) The survey results provide overwhelming evidence to support the introduction of a scheme on Albert Street, Every Street and Mosley Street, Nelson.
- (2) That the comments be noted.
- (3) To alleviate congestion at these junctions.

BACKGROUND

1. Following a request by residents to Cllr Nadeem 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 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 survey.
2. A report was submitted to this Committee on 3 July 2017. It was reported that at the time the survey was undertaken there were a number of empty properties which had affected the results of the survey. It was therefore resolved that:
“The Neighbourhood Services Manager be requested to resend the questionnaire.”
3. A further questionnaire regarding the possibility of introducing residents-only parking was hand-delivered to the residents in September 2017.
4. Following a report to this Committee on 6 November 2017 were it was resolved:
“(1) That a residents-only parking scheme be introduced on Albert Street, Nelson.
(2) That the scheme be expanded to cover Every Street and Mosley Street and that a further study be conducted to include Every Street and Mosley Street.”

ISSUE

5. It was not felt necessary to re-send questionnaires to the residents of Albert Street and therefore for the benefit of this report the figures from the study conducted in September 2017 have been used. Due to there being a lower number of properties interested in residents-only parking at Nos 42–62 Albert Street, I have not included the survey results for this section of Albert Street. The report therefore concentrates on properties numbered 3–35 and 2–36 Albert Street only.
6. Questionnaires were sent to residents of Mosley Street and Every Street and a traffic study was conducted in May 2018.
7. A plan showing the area surveyed and the extent of the proposed residents' parking bays can be found in Appendix 1.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Detailed results of the parking duration survey are available on request.

SURVEY RESULTS

- 11 I 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.

Albert Street Nelson (survey conducted September 2017)

12. In this area, 25 residential properties which would be entitled to a permit were surveyed, with 23 replies.

In favour of providing the scheme..... 23 (92 per cent of total properties surveyed)
Against providing the scheme..... 0 (0 per cent of total properties surveyed)
No reply 1 (4 per cent of total properties surveyed)
Empty property 1 (4 per cent of total properties surveyed)

Mosley Street, Nelson

13. In this area, 31 residential properties which would be entitled to a permit were surveyed, with 26 replies.

In favour of providing the scheme..... 26 (84 per cent of total properties surveyed)
Against providing the scheme..... 0 (0 per cent of total properties surveyed)
No reply 5 (6 per cent of total properties surveyed)

Every Street, Nelson

14. In this area, 19 residential properties which would be entitled to a permit were surveyed, with 10 replies.

In favour of providing the scheme..... 10 (53 per cent of total properties surveyed)
Against providing the scheme..... 0 (0 per cent of total properties surveyed)
No reply 9 (47 per cent of total properties surveyed)

ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY RESULTS

15. Taking all three streets into account as a whole, the results of the questionnaire indicate that there is a very strong desire for the introduction of the scheme with 79 per cent (59) of the residents responding positively to the survey.

PARKING DURATION SURVEY

16. 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.

17. **Survey Results for Properties Numbered 3–35 and 2–36 Albert Street Nelson** (survey conducted July 2017)

Date		Morning	Noon	Evening
		%	%	%
Mon	Capacity	79	71	57
	Residential	27	20	19
Tue	Capacity	82	89	86
	Residential	39	32	29
Wed	Capacity	93	79	89
	Residential	42	32	28

Thur	Capacity	89	79	79
	Residential	44	36	45
Fri	Capacity	79	82	79
	Residential	45	35	27
Sat	Capacity	86	82	93
	Residential	54	43	35
Sun	Capacity	64	54	68
	Residential	56	60	37

18. The maximum capacity available within a suggested permit parking bay (see plan in Appendix 1) is 28 vehicles. It should be noted that additional parking takes place on the gable ends of Every Street. For the purpose of this report, this area has not been designated as residents-only parking.
19. During the week the maximum number of vehicles parked on Albert Street at any one time equated to 93 per cent capacity, and of those vehicles 42 per cent were residential. On the majority of occasions, the capacity was between 79 and 90 per cent, and of those 35 to 45 per cent were residential vehicles.
20. **Survey Results for Properties 116–136 and 115a–129 Every Street Nelson**

Date		Morning	Noon	Evening
		%	%	%
Mon	Capacity	55	55	45
	Residential	45	45	44
Tue	Capacity	50	55	50
	Residential	50	36	40
Wed	Capacity	45	55	50
	Residential	55	55	60
Thur	Capacity	45	50	35
	Residential	67	50	57
Fri	Capacity	50	60	40
	Residential	60	50	75
Sat	Capacity	60	35	20
	Residential	50	57	75
Sun	Capacity	30	25	30
	Residential	50	60	66

21. The maximum capacity available within a suggested permit parking bay (see plan in Appendix 1) is 20 vehicles.
22. During the week the maximum number of vehicles parked on Every Street at any one time equated to 45 per cent capacity, and of those vehicles 55 per cent were residential. On the majority of occasions, the capacity was between 50 and 55 per cent, and of those approximately 55 to 55 per cent were residential vehicles.

23. Survey Results for Properties 1–33 and 2–28 Mosley Street Nelson

Date		Morning	Noon	Evening
		%	%	%
Mon	Capacity	55	65	60
	Residential	32	23	25
Tue	Capacity	50	60	50
	Residential	35	25	30
Wed	Capacity	58	63	55
	Residential	35	32	27
Thur	Capacity	63	58	68
	Residential	40	39	30
Fri	Capacity	48	55	53
	Residential	47	32	38
Sat	Capacity	45	58	58
	Residential	50	35	39
Sun	Capacity	95	68	45
	Residential	32	37	28

24. The maximum capacity available within a suggested permit parking bay (see plan in Appendix 1) is 40 vehicles.
25. During the week the maximum number of vehicles parked on Mosley Street at any one time equated to 59 per cent capacity, and of those vehicles 34 per cent were residential. On the majority of occasions, the capacity was between 50 and 60 per cent, and of those approximately 30 to 40 per cent were residential vehicles.
26. The majority of issues with parking, including double parking, were at the Manchester Road end of both Mosley Street and Albert Street. On several occasions, I 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 or Mosley Street to Every Street. This occasionally involved vehicles reversing out onto Manchester Road.
27. It should be noted that of the questionnaires returned for Albert Street in September 2017, 13 residents asked that it be made one-way. This matter was previously referred to Lancashire County Council Highways as a separate issue. The matter was discussed at the Traffic Liaison meeting on 22 June 2017 where it was resolved that:
- “The group discussed the traffic in this area of Nelson and agreed that that we would be unable to support the need for a one-way restriction as they can create road safety issues due to increased traffic speeds and limits permeability. It was agreed that the road markings on Manchester Road at the junction with Albert Street be re-lined to re-enforce the correct traffic flow and improve driver behaviour in this vicinity.”*
28. Members may wish to consider referring this ongoing issue to Lancashire County Council (Highways), recommending that a no-parking restriction is added to the gable ends of 66–68 and 74–76 Manchester Road, Nelson, to alleviate these issues.
29. In general, a parking pattern emerged of non- residential vehicles parking in similar places on the street on a regular basis. On the whole, there was not much variance to this pattern which

would indicate that residents, at least during the time of the survey, would have problems parking near to their properties on a regular basis.

30. Officers did not witness any vehicles travelling at high speed whilst the survey was conducted.
31. The introduction singularly of residents-only parking on Albert Street, Mosley Street or Every is likely to have a direct impact on each other. It is therefore recommended that the roads are not treated in isolation.

CONCLUSIONS

32. The results of the questionnaire indicate that there is a very strong desire for the introduction of the scheme.
33. The traffic survey confirmed that parking is at a premium on Albert Street and Mosley Street, and there is sufficient evidence that non-residential vehicles are causing a problem regularly for more than six hours per day.
34. Whilst the survey shows that parking was available on Every Street, it should not be treated in isolation as the introduction of residents-only parking of other streets will have an impact on Every Street. Therefore, the request for residents-only parking on Every Street, Nelson, should be considered in conjunction and not separately to Mosley Street and Albert Street.
35. There is still sufficient available kerbside parking on the bottom section of Albert Street (property numbers 42–62) and at this time it is felt that the introduction of a scheme on one section of Albert Street, Nelson, does increase the risk of non-residential parking increasing on the other section.
36. It should be noted that 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 resident are currently experiencing from multiple vehicle ownership on the street.
38. 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 and Mosley Street. This matter has been referred to Lancashire County Council (Highways) previously and refused. However, members may wish to consider the alternative suggestion of no-parking on the gable ends of Manchester Road.

IMPLICATIONS

Policy: None arising directly from this report.

Financial: None arising directly from this report. All costs would be met by and all income accrued retained by LCC.

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: See paragraphs 26 to 28 of the report, with respect to double parking.

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.