PARKING STRATEGY WORKING PARTY held at 7.30 pm at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN on 19 OCTOBER 2000

Present:- Councillor M A Hibbs – Chairman.

Councillors Mrs D Cornell, R A Merrion, R J O'Neill and A R Row.

Officers in attendance:- M R Dellow, Mrs T Halford, Mrs S McLagan, M T Purkiss and A Stewart.

PS18 APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs M A Caton, R J Copping and G Sell.

Councillors Mrs D Cornell and M A Hibbs declared their respective interests insofar as they were members of Saffron Walden Town Council.

PS19 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1 August 2000 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PS20 BUSINESS ARISING

PS11 - Highway Signage and white lining

It was noted that this work had still not been undertaken and the Head of Community and Leisure Services said that she would undertake to get a reply from the County Council and report to the meeting of the Working Party on 13 November 2000.

(ii) Minute PS16 – Resident Parking Scheme – Museum Street

It was noted that the residents had now applied for a permanent permit and this had been issued.

(iii) Minute PS17 – Car parking – Stansted Airport

It was noted that Bishop's Stortford Town Council had expressed concern about users of Stansted Airport leaving their cars around the town. This was also a problem within Uttlesford and had recently been considered by the Airport Working Party. It was understood that the Development Control Sub-Committee was also looking at taking enforcement action in relation to a number of unauthorised sites.

PS21 **DECRIMINALISATION**

It was noted that the County Council had deferred taking a decision on this matter on 28 September until 5 December 2000. Written confirmation of this had been requested and it was not yet known when the relevant County Council report would be available.

If officers were able to obtain a copy of the report, it would be submitted to all Members of the Council.

If it was not possible for the matter to be considered at the meeting of the Community Services Committee on 5 December, it might be necessary to arrange a further meeting to determine the Council's response to Essex County Council's decision.

It was understood that a number of district councils were still not supporting decriminalisation because of the lack of clarity over financial arrangements. Officers would write to all Essex district councils to ascertain their current approach to this issue.

No formal response had yet been received to the letter which had been sent to Essex County Council on 15 August 2000 and this would be pursued.

Members noted that within the letter of 15 August there were some issues which involved the Police Authority and officers would approach Councillor Chambers to seek a response to these points.

PS22 ON-STREET PARKING SURVEY – SAFFRON WALDEN

At the invitation of the Chairman the Clerk of Saffron Walden Town Council attended the meeting for this item.

At the last meeting of the Working Party Members had been provided with options for the use of the Resident's Parking Streets (RPS) for short-term visitor parking. Officers were asked to provide further information about the opportunity to offer free and paid parking on designated RPS. It was also agreed that a survey of the daytime usage of the streets would be undertaken in order that Members could appreciate the effect of either of the following options.

Option A	Free parking for a limited period of 1 hour, no return within 2 hours			
Implications	People circling the streets			
·	RPS residents who currently pay			
	feeling aggrieved			
	Decrease in car park revenue			
	Dedicated RPS Parking Attendant			
Cost of changing order	£1,500			
Staffing/Financial Implications	£16,493			
Predicted Income	Nil			

Cost of installing P&D machines	Nil
Option B	Paid parking on designated streets
Implications	 RPS residents who currently pay might utilise the non-resident on-street parking spaces Potential increase in local trade Whilst there would be income generation, this has to be balanced against the potential decrease in car park revenue
Cost of changing order	£1,500
Staffing/Financial Implications	£8,913
Predicted Income	@25p for 1 hour = £624 per space @30p for 1 hour = £749 per space @50p for 1 hour = £1,248 per space
Cost of installing P&D machines	7 machines = £21,000

The survey had been carried out between 7 August and 15 September 2000. Parking Attendants had been asked to monitor the usage for each morning and afternoon at regular times in order to ensure a consistent approach for all nine RPS streets. The results suggested that of the 140 resident parking scheme spaces, there was the potential to create 54 on-street short-term visitor parking spaces.

The table below illustrates the situation, including a reference to the suggested bay numbers which could be used for short-term visitor parking.

RPS Street	No of spaces	Average morning occupation	Average afternoon occupation	Mean available	Proposed bay Nos (see maps in Appendix 1)
Abbey Lane	9	2	2	9*	1
High Street	6	4	4	0	N/A
Museum Street	11	2	2	5	1
Fairycroft Road	14	9	8	5	3
East Street	19	6	7	12	3
Gold Street	27	17	16	7	4
Castle Street	54	29	32	16	4 & 6
TOTAL	140	67	69	54	

^{*}It would be appropriate to offer short-term visitor parking on the whole of Abbey Lane as there is only one bay.

The Working Party then considered the financial implications of the two options. A number of assumptions had been made, including that the hours of operation

would be between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm and that all 54 spaces would be utilised.

It was also assumed that the greater part of usage in the first instance would be by people who would otherwise be paying to park at 25p per hour elsewhere in the town, representing a loss of car park income of £33,696 for each of the options.

Option A

Expenditure	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
Cost of changing Order	£1,500	Nil	Nil
Staffing	£16,493*	£16,988	£17,498
TOTAL	£17,993	£16,988	£17,498

^{*}Indicates the necessity to employ a full-time Parking Attendant to monitor the free parking for one hour with no return within two hours.

Option B

Expenditure	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
Cost of changing Order	£1,500	Nil	Nil
Staffing	£8,913**	£9,180	£9,455
7 P&D machines	£21,000	£9,905	£2,992
TOTAL	£31,413	£12,085	£12,447

^{**}Indicates the necessity to employ a part-time Parking Attendant for 17.5 hours per week to monitor the paid parking on designated streets.

Income	@25p per hour	@30p per hour	@50p per hour
	£624 per space	£749 per space	£1,248 per space
TOTAL INCOME FOR	TAL INCOME FOR £33,696		£67,392
54 spaces			

Income vs Expenditure

Income	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	
@25p	33,696	33,696	33,696	
Expenditure	31,413	12,085	12,447	
Profit/Loss	2,283	21,611	21,249	
@30p	40,435	40,435	40,435	
Expenditure	31,413	12,085	12,447	
Profit/Loss	9,022	28,350	27,988	
@50p	67,392	67,392	67,392	
Expenditure	31,413	12,085	12,447	
Profit/Loss	35,979	55,307	54,945	

Members also considered a letter from the Castle Street Residents' Association and a parking survey which had been carried out by them. Letters from the Saffron Walden Chamber of Trade and Commerce, Mrs S Walker and Mr M Bayer were also considered by the Working Party. Additional representations had been received from residents in Chaters Hill, Freshwell Street, Hill Street and New Road who had been affected by the introduction of

resident parking schemes and had requested that the Council consider these streets for inclusion in the scheme at some future date.

Members concluded from the survey work that there was an opportunity of providing local shoppers with limited on street parking in Saffron Walden.

Option A offered the opportunity of providing free parking for one hour with no return within two hours. With this option it was possible that drivers would circle the street in an attempt to find a parking space. Permit holders would feel aggrieved and as a consequence it was possible that they would request a reduction in the fee. With this option there would also be a decrease in car parking revenue and the Council would have to employ a full-time dedicated resident parking scheme attendant to carry out enforcement. The financial costs would be in the region of £16,493 for a parking attendant plus approximately £1,500 in order to change the on-street parking order. There would be no revenue by adopting this option.

Option B offered the opportunity of one hour's paid parking with no return within two hours. Whilst there was still the potential for people circling the street, if people were aware that they had to pay, they would probably be as likely to use the car parks as there would be no financial incentive to keep circling the streets. Introduction of new car park signage would help to alleviate this problem.

The possibility of residents feeling aggrieved could be overcome by allowing permit holders to park without charge in the pay and display bays in the event of all other resident parking scheme spaces being utilised.

Members appreciated that whilst there might be income generation with this option it would need to be balanced against potential income loss from the car parks. It was noted that staff rotas had recently been altered in order to enable the patrolling of the resident parking scheme streets between the hours of 6.00 pm and 9.00 pm. Attendants had successfully managed to curtail the illegal parking of non-permit holders during these hours. There had been no excess charge notices issued in the last three months between these hours.

With regard to the financial implications relating to the increased staffing for this option, there would be the opportunity to redefine existing practices. It was considered that this would negate the necessity for there to be any extra staffing requirements, thereby reducing the budgetary requirements by £8,913. The overall general fund revenue implications could be further reduced if the pay and display machines were purchased from capital. Members considered that the purchase of these machines from capital should be investigated and that further investigations needed to be carried out concerning the options for and the design of the machines, particularly within conservation areas. In addressing the financial implications Members considered that it would be more prudent, whilst assuming that 54 spaces would be available, for the financial calculation to be be reduced to 50% of usage rather than 100%.

Councillor O'Neill drew attention to the fact that there were 22 spaces at the junction of Castle Street and Museum Street and six spaces from the corner of Castle Street to the Saffron Hotel which were on County Council owned land and where free parking for two hours was available. He drew attention to the dilemma of these free spaces being in the same vicinity as those for which this Council was proposing to charge. Councillor O'Neill also drew attention to the availability of parking in Church Path and asked that officers investigate the status of this highway.

RECOMMENDED that

- Officers consult with resident parking scheme residents on Option B, on the assumption that the scheme will operate from 9.00 am to 5.00 pm and with a charge of 25p for one hour.
- 2 Further consideration be given to purchasing the pay and display machines from capital funds.
- The issue of using bays adjacent to the free parking areas in Castle Street be the subject of consultation with residents.
- The consultation timetable as set out in the report be approved with a view to new proposals being implemented by 1 April 2001.
- 5 Consideration of the issue of zoning be deferred.

PS23 ORANGE BADGE SCHEME

Councillor Hibbs expressed concern that the number of spaces available for Orange Badge holders in Saffron Walden was reducing. It was agreed that this matter would be referred to the Uttlesford Access Group.

PS24 PARKING IN GREAT DUNMOW

In answer to a question from Councillor Merrion, it was reported that the free parking trial in Great Dunmow was impacting on income. The scheme would not be reviewed until December 2001. Members would be provided with an interim financial report at a future meeting.

PS25 **NEXT MEETING**

Members agreed that the commencement of the next meeting on 13 November should be brought forward to 6.00 pm.

The meeting ended at 9.55 pm.