

# High Brooms Permit Parking

For Joint Transportation Board on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2023

---

## Summary

**Lead Member:** Councillor Justine Rutland

**Lead Director:** Lee Colyer

**Head of Service:** Jane Fineman

**Report Author:** Nicholas Baldwin

**Classification:** Public document (non-exempt)

**Wards Affected:** Sherwood

## Recommendations

Officer / Committee recommendations as supported by the Portfolio Holder:

1. That the Joint Transport Board endorse the drafting and advertising of a traffic regulation order which promotes additional permit parking space within the existing zone.
2. That the results of that consultation exercise be reported to a future meeting of this Board.

# 1. Introduction and Background

- 1.1 Following requests for more of the roadside space within Permit Parking Zone HB to be restricted to permit holders, a consultation exercise was undertaken.
- 1.2 This report provides background information about the creation and operation of the zone together with details of the consultation undertaken and the responses received.

# 2. Zone HB Permit Parking History and Operation

- 2.1 Permit parking was introduced in Clifton Road plus parts of Brook Road and Oak Road in 2012 following requests from Members and endorsement by this Board.
- 2.2 Prior to introduction, a survey of residents views had shown that 71% of respondents favoured the idea of permit parking.
- 2.3 To allow for differing views for and against the idea of permit parking, only parts of three streets were subsequently subject to a restriction which allowed for permit holders to park between the hours of 9am and 5pm Mondays to Fridays without restriction whereas non-permit holders were restricted to a two hour stay.
- 2.4 In the decade since introduction there has been little comment from residents themselves about the scheme and how well it has served its purpose. Lack of complaint has been taken to be a silent endorsement.
- 2.5 The number of permits being issued as a ratio of available roadside space is, to some extent, an indicator of how well a scheme functions. Although we have limited data in that respect, in 2016, when the current Parking Strategy was published, 27 permits were active, being approximately 11% of eligible properties. An estimated 51 roadside spaces are available within the restricted bays.
- 2.6 At the time of writing this report, there were 39 permits currently issued.

# 3. 2023 Consultation

- 3.1 During the latter part of 2022, comments began to be received from residents who indicated that they were having increased difficulty in finding space to park within the permit bays and requesting that there be more bays provided.
- 3.2 To properly assess local opinion a survey of views was undertaken during the latter part of February and throughout March 2023. This was to establish whether there would be enough support for increasing the amount of permit parking space within the existing zone.

- 3.3 Four basic pieces of information were sought. Firstly, whether the respondent had a permit at present, secondly whether they experienced difficulty parking within the current permit parking bays and thirdly, whether they experienced difficulty parking within the zone but outside the defined permit bays. The final question was whether they would support the creation of more permit parking within the current zone boundaries.
- 3.4 Of the 238 properties consulted, responses were received from 67 of them with two properties each supplying two responses. That equates to a 28.1% and 29% response rate depending on whether the response from individual or response from property is considered.
- 3.5 The responses received are tabulated below:-

	Clifton Road	Brook Road	Oak Road
PERMITS			
Have permit	22	0	2
Don't have permit	33	8	4
PROBLEMS PARKING IN BAYS?			
Never	11	3	5
Sometimes	23	3	1
Always	18	2	0
No Answer	3	0	0
PROBLEMS PARKING IN UNCONTROLLED AREA?			
Never	7	2	3
Sometimes	12	4	3
Always	36	2	0
SUPPORT MORE BAYS?			
Yes	35	5	2
No	20	3	4

- 3.6 The results therefore show 42 respondents from 41 addresses in favour of extra permit parking bays and 27 respondents from 27 addresses against the creation of more permit parking bays. The reason for the mis-match in numbers is that two responses from the same address gave both for and against answers.
- 3.7.1 It should, perhaps, be noted that some respondents did make additional comments. These generally followed a similar theme, being either that we should expand the zone or make the current restrictions more onerous, involving a greater period during which permit holders had preference or that the parking should be permit holder only at all times.
- 3.8 The survey was, however, undertaken on the clear basis that we would at this stage only be looking at the possibility of increasing the number of bays within the existing zone boundary and with the same restriction. Any consideration of broader changes will need to be done at a later date, if deemed appropriate, since it would involve far greater input from staff due to the complexity of making such amendments.

## 4 Options Considered

- 4.1 Whilst there is majority support for more permit parking bays from respondents, it is not overwhelming and there is a considerable level of objection to the idea.
- 4.2 Options would, therefore, be to A) Do nothing; B) Prepare a proposal for increasing the number of bays and conduct a further informal consultation; or C) prepare a proposal for formal consultation.
- 4.3 With only 17.6% of the overall number of residential properties showing support for change, Option A is a viable one. It would not mean that the matter was permanently closed. It could be re-visited in the future. It would clearly be unpopular with some though.
- 4.4 Option B would allow for an expansion plan to be developed taking into account all the information gathered about where support or objection lies. The responses do not, for instance, suggest that any problems are as pronounced in Brook Road or Oak Road. A further informal consultation, however, would have potential negative aspects. Experience has shown that, the more times residents are asked for a view, the smaller the response rate.
- 4.5 Based on the information that has been received through the consultation process, we would not recommend making the whole of the roadside space in Zone HB subject to permit holder restrictions. There is insufficient support to do that, so a detailed proposal will only expand the scheme.
- 4.6 Option C would similarly allow for a proposal to be produced but, instead of seeking further informal views it would proceed straight to a formal consultation. The main differences are that, with a formal consultation, anybody can respond, and if there are no objections raised, a Traffic Regulation Order would be made and the changes introduced.
- 4.7 Option B would be brought back to this Board for further consideration whilst Option C would only be brought back should objections be raised and the Board's recommendation be required.

## 5 Preferred Option and Reason

- 5.1 Option C is preferred because it will save prolonging the matter unnecessarily. It is considered that we have sufficient information to be able to do this. It is important to understand that a formal proposal will allow for representations to be made before any final decisions are made. Part of that process could involve amendments if comments received suggest that they are appropriate. It is, therefore, considered that there is little to be gained by taking the longer (Option B) route to a result.

## 6 Consultation on Options

- 6.1 If Members of this Board endorse the recommendation that we proceed to formal consultation (Option C) a proposal will be drafted and a statutory consultation process will begin.
- 6.2 Assuming that some objection is made to the proposals, a further report will be brought to a future meeting of this Board.