

## Feedback to WSCC on Proposed Parking Management Plan - April 2019

### General comments:

1. If WSCC go ahead and implement a city wide parking management plan then CDC would recommend that the implementation is phased which would allow CDC to review any displacement issues, recruit and train staff to carry out enforcement and recruit and train staff in the administration of the plan.
2. Businesses where there are 'permit holder only' proposals may have issues with access for customers.
3. The implications of the proposals on the public realm are largely limited to the physical impact of any required signage or road markings. Given the urban setting of the streets involved it is unlikely that there would be significant adverse impact in the introduction of double yellow line road markings. However, the proposals involve a significant amount of ancillary signage, larger signs at the junction of each road and smaller repeater signs at regular intervals along each affected street. The resultant proliferation of signage is of concern, particularly in sensitive areas such as those designated as a conservation area. It should be noted that whilst there is concern as to the potential impact, the signage proposed, if undertaken by the County Council, would likely constitute permitted development and would not require planning permission.
4. Road name labels on the maps restrict viewing the maps in places and the coloured lines are very thin which causes difficulty with fully understanding the maps.
5. We understand that this is the first stage of the outcome of the Road Space Audit. Subsequent stages include the encouragement of modal shift and possible re-apportionment of roadspace to that end. As such we consider that consideration of cycle lane provision within proposals at this stage is important. There would appear to be no or limited consideration of cycle lanes within these proposals.
6. There may be concerns from residents regarding the increase of commuter parking in residential streets. It is clear that access for residents and deliveries must be preserved and this must be carefully communicated to those affected. Parking policy should always encourage commuters to park in

car parks rather than on-street and it is therefore important that and commuter parking permits are sold at a price which reflects this policy.

7. Whilst the majority of the proposals affect the area outside of the immediate city centre the full impact of the proposals on the retail sector has not been considered at this stage and this will require careful assessment to understand the potential loss of any retailers as a result which could be significant on footfall. (This is relevant in particular to the proposals for Zone H). A full consultation with the retail sector should be undertaken.
8. The demands for parking provision from the larger employers and organisations in the city will require consideration as part of any on-street and off-street parking provision and these demands are likely to fluctuate in future years.
9. The opportunity to use under-utilised road space for coach and lorry parking should be investigated and implemented if practicable. If successful this would release the existing coach/lorry park for more appropriate use to support the local economy.
10. The report proposes a change to the process undertaken to allow commuters to park on-street. Operational costs, time and policy associated with introducing amendments to on-street permits have not been considered at this stage, and will require further assessment and understanding.
11. The impact on air quality as a result of the proposed Parking Management Plan is unclear. This is especially the case for existing Air Quality Management Areas at St Pancras, Orchard Street and A27 Stockbridge roundabout, Chichester.
12. Encouraging non-car modes of transport such as walking and cycling, particularly by building this into day-to-day activities, will help to encourage behavioural change into the fabric of a place and make such modal choice the default. Such an approach will in itself help to reduce parking demand through encouraging cycling and walking for short journeys where possible. The potential for cycle storage locations has not been included but could be considered. Dual purpose lanes should be encouraged.
13. Car Clubs warrant consideration with regard to road space. Further roll-out of the car club through Traffic Regulation Order bays in the residential areas could reduce residential parking demand through a collaborative consumption/resource sharing approach to accessing a car. A single car club vehicle can be shared by many of the local community. In particular as access to a second car this helps to reduce demand for spaces.
14. We note that provision for Electric Vehicle Charging Points / bays has not been included in the proposals and we recommend that this should be considered.
15. There is no inclusion of taxi ranks within the maps.

16. The introduction of the proposals could encourage an increase in the number of properties who choose to develop part of their front garden into a driveway which might affect biodiversity.
17. The proposals for permit holders do not include Sundays. Feedback from residents of the existing controlled parking zone suggests that Sundays should be included.

### **Specific comments relating to proposed zones:**

Zone A – Currently no parking issue in large parts of this proposed zone. Limited parking for the shops on Stockbridge road and public hall other side of Co-Op.

Zone B – Currently no parking issue in large parts of this proposed zone. Adequate parking provision is required for the area around Westward House.

Zone C – Could more Double Yellow Lines be introduced in areas where the buses struggle to get through? Sixth Form Bishop Luffa students will not be able to park. Parking for Parklands School - will parents be able to pick up from resident bays? Can the Residents bay outside shop be made into a shared bay?

Zone D – Could additional DYL be introduced as there will be a number of areas where there will be parking on both sides of the road – e.g. Cedar Drive – and this could assist? Cedar Drive is on a bus route one side will need to be DYL as it may be too narrow.

Zone F Extension – Where do the residents of Ormonde Avenue park as the proposed restriction is no parking Mon-Sat 9am-5pm?

Zone G Extension – Hay Road – DYL proposed all around the recreation ground and permit holder parking or clearway. This means that any event on the recreation ground would not have any parking. Same applies to parents collecting / dropping off at the school. More bays needed for shop.

Zone H Extension – Introduce a Loading Bay into the Hornet where there is proposed some Limited Waiting Only. This Limited Waiting should be 30 minutes rather than 1 hour as the 30 minutes will encourage use of the shops in the Hornet whereas 1 hour may encourage drivers to park in the bay and use the shops within the city centre. Kerb blips are required along one side of the Hornet (as at present) to prevent parking. Change DYL in layby outside number 98 to provide either limited waiting or resident permit.

Zone I – Parking for parents attending any event (assembly etc.) from 9-10am will be prevented. Where do parents park in these circumstances? Either side of the

clearway should have DYL for certain length. Is there an issue with parking in this location at present and is it considered that there would be one in the future?

Zone L Extension – Properties at the end of Westgate Road next to railway line opposite entrance to Bishop Luffa School – houses 109-119 require permits to enable parking as only provision shown is either limited waiting or double yellow lines. Suggest extending the 3 hours. The bays should be shared residents and limited waiting. Can there be bays on the north side of Westgate?

Zone N Extension – Consideration should be given to whether there is sufficient space for a bus to get through the road where there are proposed areas for single yellow lines permitting parking between certain hours on one side and Permit parking on the other side of the road at the same time.

Zone O Extension – We note that a ‘Permit Holders Only’ restriction is proposed for The Peacheries. The parking team has received feedback that this road is difficult to access at times given that cars are parked on both sides of the road, therefore some yellow line restriction may be preferable.

Zone P - Is there an issue with parking in this location at present or is it considered that there would be one in the future?

Zone Q - Is there an issue with parking in this location at present or is it considered that there would be one in the future? Is there potential to add more bays East of Summersdale Rd from Broadway as shared use bays to enable users of the convenience store and doctor’s surgery to park in this location?

Zone R – Is there an issue with parking in this location at present or is it considered that there would be one in the future? No junction protections have been suggested – should some be added?

Zone S – No red shown on the key but we assume red on the plan to mean DYL. There are sections where there are permit holders only on DYL, e.g. Graylingwell Rd, Baxendale Rd, Bostock Rd. Has sufficient parking been left for residents after the DYL have been introduced? Outside 74 Bradshaw Rd would be best as a limited waiting bay for the shop.

Zone T – Visitors to the Graveyard use Church Road for parking, under the proposals this would be ‘permit holder only’ – where would visitors to the Graveyard park? Parts of Church Road are too narrow for parking and would suit DYL better. Could kerb blips be introduced along part of the DYL outside the school in St James Road to assist with enforcement? Extend the junction protection on the Charles Avenue onto Oving Road junction.

Zone U – No inclusion of the residential estates off the main Stane Street – could this mean an increase in issues in the residential areas if not included? Could kerb blips be used along the DYL outside the school to prevent any parking (given the fact

that the observation period which is required for DYL means that the CEOs can't issue a PCN immediately). Need a bus stop for school.

Zone V – Permit Holders Only areas proposed for locations which are currently where residents park, but not all areas on the map have been included which are used in this way. Could more DYL as junction protections be introduced? The 'limited waiting only' of 3 hours along Florence Road – should the 'no return' duration be extended from the 1 hour to 2 hours or potential shared use?

Zone W – Will cause issues for the parents of children at the Free School where parking is limited and who currently park in Langdale Whyke and Willowbed and walk over the bridge with children to school. Could cause issues on the main road outside the Free School.

Zone X – Pay and Display proposed – 60p per hour. No limit on the number of hours proposed – will this be subject to a maximum number of hours? Could this cause issues for the businesses in Terminus Road with not having access to sufficient parking in this location? Parking payment machines could be vulnerable in this location as it is not well-used at night. (Approx 6 machines required). Sundays have not been included – why is this? Limited waiting currently – this is better for businesses as it turns over spaces. Introduction of P& D will encourage parking all day potentially.

Zone Y – Pay and Display proposed – 60p per hour. No limit on the number of hours proposed – will this be subject to a maximum number of hours? Could this cause issues for the businesses in Quarry Lane with not having access to sufficient parking in this location? Parking payment machines could be vulnerable in this location as it is not well-used at night. (Approx 6 machines required). Sundays have not been included – why is this? Limited waiting currently – this is better for businesses as it turns over spaces. Introduction of P& D will encourage parking all day potentially.