

Bath & North East Somerset Council		
DECISION MAKER:	Cllr Anthony Clarke, Cabinet Member for Transport	
DECISION DATE:	On or after 1 <sup>st</sup> July 2015	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:
		E 2715
TITLE:	Review of Car Park orders - Batheaston and Radstock	
WARD:	Batheaston and Radstock	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
<b>List of attachments to this report:</b>		
Appendix 1 - VOSP/TRO/01 “Proposal for London Road East Car Park”		
Appendix 2 - VOSP/TRO/02 “Proposal for Church Street Car Park”		
Appendix 3 - VOSP/TRO/03 “Proposal for Waterloo Road Car Park”		
Appendix 4 - “Equality Impact Assessment / Equality Analysis”		
Appendix 5 - “Car Parking Updates FORMAL CONSULTATION”		
Appendix 6 – “Risk Register”		

## 1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 To consider the points raised during the public consultation of the variation to the Traffic Regulation Order "(Off Street Parking Places) (North East Somerset) Order 2013" and decide how to proceed with the making of the Order.
- 1.2 The proposals consist of changes within 3 separate car parks, one in Batheaston and two in Radstock.

## 2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The Cabinet Member approves the recommendations outlined below.
  - 2.1.1 **London Road car park, Batheaston** is implemented as publicly advertised. Maximum 3 hour stay between the hours of 8am - 6pm, Monday to Friday. Unlimited free parking at all other times.

- 2.1.2 **Church Street car park, Radstock** is implemented as publicly advertised. Maximum 5 hour stay between the hours of 8am and 6pm, Monday to Saturday, excluding Bank Holidays, on display of a ticket from a parking machine. No return within 1 hour. Unlimited free parking at all other times.
- 2.1.3 The western area of **Waterloo Road car park, Radstock** is implemented as publicly advertised. Maximum 4 hour stay between the hours of 8am and 6pm, Monday to Saturday, excluding Bank Holidays, on display of a ticket from a pay and display machine. No return within 1 hour. Free unlimited parking at all other times. The uncontrolled area of the car park to continue to provide unlimited free parking at all times.
- 2.2 The Cabinet Member also agrees to the following possible adjustments outlined below.
- 2.2.1 Any adjustment to the time limits within the car parks be undertaken no earlier than 12 months from the date of the implementation of the scheme and at the request of stakeholders. This is to ensure that any impacts on behaviours are fully understood before changes are made.

### **3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)**

- 3.1 No changes to the fees and charges, either value of or duration of application, are being made as part of this proposal, therefore no changes to parking income levels are expected.
- 3.2 To implement free vend Pay & Display in Radstock requires the installation of Pay & Display machines to facilitate the free vend process. The funding for the machines and installations of the machines is included within the Radstock regeneration project capital funding.
- 3.3 As part of the Pay & Display installation it is necessary to change the tariff boards within the car park to indicate to users the terms and conditions of the car park. This will cost approximately £5k and funding for this is also included within in the capital budget for that project.
- 3.4 To ensure that the public can differentiate between the free areas and the time limit areas lining work within the car park will also be necessary. This will be funded from the capital budget for the project.
- 3.5 Ongoing maintenance and enforcement costs are incorporated within existing revenue budgets.
- 3.6 Any future review process that necessitates significant investigations and/or changes to the operations within the car parks, such as additional parking equipment will require specific funding to be agreed prior to commencement and cannot be funded from existing budgets and resources. In this circumstance further formal decision would be sought.

## **4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 A proportionate Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out. No discriminatory factors have been identified. The Equalities Impact Assessment is included as Appendix 4.

## **5 THE REPORT**

- 5.1 Consideration needs to be given to the responses received and a decision made on the way forward.

### **LONDON ROAD CAR PARK**

- 5.2 London Road car park currently has a 3 hour time limit with no return within 1 hour that applies 24 hours per day every day of the week.
- 5.3 The Batheaston Parish Council have requested a reduced level of controlled hours as they are aware that the residents use the car park for parking during the evening and weekends to prevent parking in other locations on the highway that may cause network issues and inconvenience.
- 5.4 As the car park does have spare capacity and is rarely full it is considered that this proposal can be accommodated with little detriment on the general user of the car park. The time restriction Monday to Friday is designed to continue to deter commuter parking in the car park during the peak days for such activity.

### **CHURCH STREET CAR PARK**

- 5.5 As a result of the Radstock regeneration project significant changes have occurred within the town. This includes the loss of some parking areas. In order to mitigate this loss the proposal is to increase the size of Church Street car park and the introduction of time limits in two car parks in the town.
- 5.6 A parking study was undertaken by the Transport Policy Team as part of the overall regeneration project which recommended the introduction of time limits in the car parks as a way to increase turnover of spaces to help support the economic viability and vitality of the town as a whole.
- 5.7 As part of the consultation process, a number of objections were received to both the proposal for Church Street car park and the Waterloo Road car park as outlined below:
- (1) A number of businesses in the town have suggested that 5 hours was too short a period for workers and visitors to their businesses and that the time limit should not be implemented.

- (2) A number of retailers within the town have suggested that 5 hours was too long a period and they requested a 2 hour time limit to encourage turnover of spaces.
- 5.8 Therefore it is recommended that the time limit as advertised is implemented to allow for the impact to be assessed.
- 5.9 Any adjustments necessary can then be proposed by stakeholder groups to be fully assessed by the Parking Service Team. It is recommended that no changes be made for a minimum of 12 months from the date of implementation to ensure that the changes are fully understood.

### **WATERLOO ROAD CAR PARK**

- 5.10 As a result of the Radstock regeneration project significant changes have occurred within the town.
- 5.11 A parking study was undertaken by the Transport Policy Team as part of the overall regeneration project which recommended the introduction of time limits in the car parks as a way to increase turnover of spaces and thus help support the economic viability and vitality of the town as a whole.
- 5.12 As part of the consultation process, a number of objections were received to both the proposal for Church Street car park and the Waterloo Road car park as outlined below:
  - (1) A number of businesses in the town suggested that 5 hours was too short a period for workers and visitors to their businesses and that the time limit should not be implemented.
  - (2) A number of retailers within the town suggested that 5 hours was too long a period and they requested a 2 hour time limit to encourage turnover of spaces.
- 5.13 Therefore it is recommended that the time limit as advertised is implemented to allow for the impact to be assessed.
- 5.14 Any adjustments necessary can then be proposed by stakeholder groups to be fully assessed by the Parking Service Team. It is recommended that no changes be made for a minimum of 12 months from the date of implementation to ensure that the changes are fully understood.

## **6 RATIONALE**

- 6.1 The proposals were consulted upon to address operational parking issues and in response to public and Ward Councillors demands.
- 6.2 The regeneration of Radstock is considered as a corporate priority by the Council.

## **7 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

7.1 In regards to London Road car park Batheaston, the following options were considered:

- (1) To not implement the change to the time limit and the times of operation. This was rejected as the proposal is supported by the Parish Council.
- (2) To implement a modified scheme. This was rejected as no objections were received.

7.2 In regards to Church Street car park, the following options were considered:

- (1) To not implement the changes to the time limit. This was rejected as the implementation of a time limit is designed to increase turnover of the car park and thus help support the economic viability of the town and is supported as part of the Parking strategy for the town.
- (2) To implement a revised time limit within the car park. This was rejected as there were opposing views to whether a time limit is necessary and the implementation of the scheme as advertised allows the impacts to be assessed and considered for future modifications.

7.3 In regards to Waterloo Road car park Radstock, the following options were considered:

- (1) To not implement the change to the time limit and the times of operation. This was rejected as the implementation of a time limit is designed to increase turnover of the car park and thus help support the economic viability of the town and is supported as part of the Parking strategy for the town.
- (2) To implement a revised time limit within the car park. This was rejected as there were opposing views to whether a time limit is necessary and the implementation of the scheme as advertised allows the impacts to be assessed and considered for future modifications.

## **8 CONSULTATION**

8.1 Ward Members; Internal transport colleagues; Other B&NES Services; Local Residents; Emergency Services.

8.2 Consultation was carried out by e-mailing internal and external contacts. Notices were also advertised in the local press and erected on site for a 21 day period from 20<sup>th</sup> January to 10<sup>th</sup> February 2015. All affected people had the opportunity to participate in the TRO consultation process, and to make their opinions known.

- 8.3 A breakdown of responses to the formal consultation is included as Appendix 5.
- 8.4 The Monitoring officer, Section 151 officer, and Strategic Director Place.

## **9 RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 9.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

<b>Contact person</b>	Chris Major - (01225) 394231
<b>Background papers</b>	
<b>Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format</b>	