

TO: EXECUTIVE  
27 SEPTEMBER 2016

---

**RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME – TWO YEAR TRIAL CONSULTATION RESPONSE**  
**Director of Environment, Culture & Communities**

**1 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The Executive at its meeting on the 12 April 2016 agreed to consult the existing householders living in the relevant areas regarding the future of the residents parking trial based on a recharge scheme as set out in Annex A. This paper appraises the Executive of the outcome of that consultation exercise and proposes a way forward in light of the outcome having due regard to the current fiscal position.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**2.1 That the Executive agrees:**

- (i) To reduce the residents parking scheme as shown in Annex A to that as shown in Annex B,**
- (ii) To maintain the current rules of the scheme without alteration (Annex C),**
- (iii) To advertise a Traffic Regulation Order to remove those areas, as above (Annex B), from the residents parking scheme, and to amend the charges in line with Annex D, and**
- (iv) To inform the residents within the original residents parking area of the outcome.**
- (v) Post implementation to thereafter review the charges as part of the annual review of fees and charges to ensure that the scheme continues to be self funded.**

**3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 In order to inform the future of the scheme, a consultation has been carried out and all residents living within the Resident Parking Scheme were invited to give their views on the key elements of the scheme. The feedback has been used to inform the future of the overall scheme on an area by area basis. The objective being to find the most suitable scheme that protects residents from the parking pressures associated with the regenerated town centre having due regard to the feedback and the need to avoid an unacceptable pressure on council budgets.

**4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 The Council has been clear that the scheme has to be self funding. From the feedback it has become clear that unless the scheme is to be totally abandoned, a compromise is necessary to allow a slightly modified scheme to continue. If the scheme was to be abandoned the risk of a significant percentage of the 3,000 new workers in the new town centre using the local estate roads for parking is considered high. Experience within some of the areas covered by the scheme proves the high risk of non local residents parking if there is no scheme in place.

## 5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1 The trial scheme was designed to be as simple and economical as was possible. The scheme avoids the need for official marked parking bays, only requiring that vehicles display a permit in the streets affected as signed. Vehicles parking in a road where the scheme operates are required to display a permit in their windscreen during the hours of operation. Failure to comply risks a Penalty Charge Notice. A number of exemptions were included to apply to postal deliveries, public services and for general loading/unloading of goods or passengers etc. **It is not proposed to change any of the current rules of the scheme (Annex B) based on the learning and results of consultation.**
- 5.2 To make the scheme self funding as was always intended it was necessary to change the charging regime. The Executive were advised of the income and expenditure relating to the current trial, together with various assumptions on the likely take up of permits to establish a fee structure for the purposes of consultation. The proposed fees that were part of the consultation reflects that assessment in order to make the scheme self funding.
- 5.3 The overall response rate was 30% of the total number of households. The consultation was not limited to 1 per household, therefore the depth of analysis is limited but helps give a general overview of the views in the community.

### Resident Consultation Summary

- 5.4 Papers were delivered to all properties within the current resident parking zones (Annex A). All householders were also able to respond on line using the Councils web page. We received 436 eligible responses to the consultation.
- 5.5 The initial questions in the consultation dealt with the location, number of cars and garages for each respondent; specifically, questions 5 and 6 identified which road and street respondents were in. The other details are summarised as follows:

**Question 8:** focussed on the use of visitor permits. The responses revealed that the majority of people used their four hour reusable permit once a week (32%) with the scratch cards being used most frequently on a monthly basis (4 hour scratch cards 32%, 24 hour scratch cards 38%).

**Question 9:** asked if the residents believed that a continued resident parking scheme would be beneficial to their road when considering the regenerated town centre and the increased shopping and working opportunities. 52% of the respondents said yes and 31% said no. (17% did not answer)

**Question 10:** asked if the residents believed that the scheme had provided a benefit to date. There was an equal split of 45% for both yes and no. (10% did not answer)

**Question 11:** asked about residents' views on the application process. It was clear from the responses that the process was considered to be user friendly with 77% saying it was simple and easy to follow.

**Question 12:** sought views on the level of enforcement. 47% felt there was not enough enforcement, 38% thought the enforcement level was about right and 9% thought there was too much enforcement. (6% did not answer).

**Question 13:** sought views with regard to the future of the scheme. This question asked if the resident would be in support of continuing the scheme if the proposed level of charges was to be introduced. Of the 419 responses to this question 186 (44%) were in favour of the scheme continuing, and 233 (56%) were against. The respondents to this question were asked to tick a box to show they were in support of continuation of the scheme with charging or a box to say they prefer the removal of the scheme. It should be noted that some of the respondents, in addition to ticking one of the two boxes, added additional comments to say they wanted the scheme to continue but did not want to pay. These results have not been tabulated as this was not an option given. Therefore any respondents saying they would like the scheme to continue have been classed as a 'continue with the scheme' response, whether or not they added comments to say without paying.

- 5.6 The responses to question 13 have been broken down into separate roads and zones so that patterns can be identified and the perceived relative merits of the scheme can be better understood.

**Zone A - Priestwood & Garth West**

Road Name	No. of properties	For	Against	Total responses received	% of properties who responded	% of responses against continuing with charges	% of responses in support of continuing with charges
		No. who support continuing with charges	No. who are against continuing with charges				
Appletree Place	6	1	4	5	83.3	80.0	20.0
Arlington Close	13	2	7	9	69.2	77.8	22.2
Clintons Green	16	1	2	3	18.8	66.7	33.3
Downshire Way (part)	11	3	4	7	63.6	57.1	42.9
Fairfax	23	5	6	11	47.8	54.5	45.5
Hawthorn Close	32	0	4	4	12.5	100.0	0.0
Honeyhill Road	57	8	12	20	35.1	60.0	40.0
Limerick Close	24	0	7	7	29.2	100.0	0.0
Portman Close	11	1	2	3	27.3	66.7	33.3
Windlebrook Green	8	1	4	5	62.5	80.0	20.0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>70.3</b>	<b>29.7</b>

**COMMENT:** The results for Zone A show that residents were not in favour of continuing the scheme with charges. Each individual road shows a % of respondents over 50% against continuing. This is likely because Zone A is the furthest from the Town Centre and so will have experienced less parking issues associated with the old town centre and expect less or little change with the new town centre.

**Zone B - Priestwood & Garth East**

Road Name	No. of properties	For	Against	Total responses received	% of properties who responded	% of properties against continuing with charges	% of properties in support of continuing with charges
		No. who support continuing with charges	No. who are against continuing with charges				
Albert Road	18	3	2	5	27.8	40.0	60.0
Ashridge Green	16	4	0	4	25.0	0.0	100.0
Binfield Road (part)	86	0	8	8	9.3	100.0	0.0
Birchetts Close	26	8	14	22	84.6	63.6	36.4
Bull Lane	13	1	1	2	15.4	50.0	50.0
Braybrooke Road (part)	6	3	2	5	83.3	40.0	60.0
Daventry Court	32	4	1	5	15.6	20.0	80.0
Dukeshill Road	37	2	10	12	32.4	83.3	16.7
Fowlers Lane	5	3	3	6	120.0	50.0	50.0
Folders Lane (part)	17	1	0	1	5.9	0.0	100.0
Fraser Road	31	5	7	12	38.7	58.3	41.7
Hart Close	29	3	8	11	37.9	72.7	27.3
Horsnille Lane	105	22	21	43	41.0	48.8	51.2
Keates Green	29	6	4	10	34.5	40.0	60.0
Merryhill Road	84	4	19	23	27.4	82.6	17.4
Shepherds Lane	47	8	16	24	51.1	66.7	33.3
St. Anthony's Close	37	0	5	5	13.5	100.0	0.0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>198</b>	32.0	61.1	38.9

**COMMENT:** The results for Zone B show that residents had a mixed opinion, for example, roads such as Albert Road, Daventry Court and Keates Green show 60%+ of respondents in favour of continuing with the charges, whilst roads such as Shepherds Lane and St Anthony's Close are against continuing. These results do support the idea that the further from the town centre you live, the less support for the scheme there is likely to be.

**Zone C - Grange Road Area**

Road Name	No. of properties	For	Against	Total responses received	% of properties who responded	% of properties against continuing with charges	% of properties In support of continuing with charges
		No. who support continuing with charges	No. who are against continuing with charges				
Grange Road	24	14	1	15	62.5	6.7	93.3
Willow Drive	17	3	1	4	23.5	25.0	75.0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>89.5</b>

**COMMENT:** The results for Zone C show that residents are strongly in favour of continuing the scheme with charges. Both roads shows have a majority of respondents in favour.

**Zone D - Deepfield Road Area**

Road Name	No. of properties	For	Against	Total responses received	% of properties who responded	% of properties against continuing with charges	% of properties In support of continuing with charges
		No. who support continuing with charges	No. who are against continuing with charges				
Deepfield Road	106	18	1	19	17.9	5.3	94.7
Fielden Place	39	2	13	15	38.5	86.7	13.3
Forest Green	18	1	12	13	72.2	92.3	7.7
North Green	33	3	4	7	21.2	57.1	42.9
Smith Square	19	2	7	9	47.4	77.8	22.2
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>29.3</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>41.3</b>

**COMMENT:** The results for Zone D show that residents had a mixed opinion, for example, the main through road for the Zone, Deepfield Road had a 95% response rate in favour of continuing with charges. However, the side roads, accessed off Deepfield Road had a different opinion, with 92% of respondents in Forest Green

Unrestricted

being against continuing. Many of the respondents from the side roads explained in their response that they believe, since the residents parking scheme was introduced, that parking from within Deepfield Road has been displaced into these side roads. This was not expected as the side roads are also within the Zone and so any vehicle parked on street in the side roads would be subject to the exact same restrictions as on Deepfield Road. If these displaced vehicles are parking illegally within the Zone then this could be an enforcement issue

**Zone E - Goodways Drive Area**

Road Name	No. of properties	For	Against	Total responses received	% of properties who responded	% of properties against continuing with charges	% of properties in support of continuing with charges
		No. who support continuing with charges	No. who are against continuing with charges				
Drayton Close	19	2	2	4	21.1	50.0	50.0
Farnham Close	30	2	0	2	6.7	0.0	100.0
Goodways Drive	37	11	2	13	35.1	15.4	84.6
Kenton Close	13	0	1	1	7.7	100.0	0.0
Tebbit Close	18	4	2	6	33.3	33.3	66.7
The Oaks	41	9	2	11	26.8	18.2	81.8
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>75.7</b>

**COMMENT:** The results for Zone E show that residents are strongly in favour of continuing the scheme with charges. All roads show a majority of respondents in favour with the exception of Kenton Road, which only had a single respondent, against continuing.

**Zone F - Old Bracknell Lane Area**

Road Name	No. of properties	For	Against	Total responses received	% of properties who responded	% of properties against continuing with charges	% of properties in support of continuing with charges
		No. who support continuing with charges	No. who are against continuing with charges				
Broome Court	20	0	2	2	10.0	100.0	0.0
Crowthorne Road	8	0	0	0	0.0	no	no

## Unrestricted

North (part)						response	response
Faircross	29	7	5	12	41.4	41.7	58.3
Friendship Way	21	2	1	3	14.3	33.3	66.7
Leverkusen Road	11	1	3	4	36.4	75.0	25.0
Old Bracknell Lane East (part)	22	6	1	7	31.8	14.3	85.7
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>42.9</b>	<b>57.1</b>

**COMMENT:** The results for Zone F show that residents are in favour of continuing the scheme with charges. Whilst the response rate was low, the main through route, Old Bracknell Lane East showed a 6 to 1 majority in favour 86%. Leverkusen Road showed a small majority against and Broome Court was also against, although again, a very small response rate.

### POSSIBLE OPTIONS

- 5.7 A key element of the consultation was on the merits or otherwise of having one self funded scheme. The feedback suggests that there is not support over all of the Zones. Accordingly, the options are either to abandon the scheme in its entirety, continue the scheme as trialled or to consider some form of variation.
- 5.8 If the Council stopped the scheme this would result in a significant number of the residents' streets being used by shoppers, shop workers, residents of the numerous new or planned town centre flats, by commuters or students from the local College. The pre-trial experience confirms that this was already the case in some zones.
- 5.9 If the results are taken in their simplest form there is a 55% response in favour of discontinuing the scheme if charges are to be introduced. However, 52% of respondents have said they believe the residents parking scheme will be beneficial in the future. To impose a change across all the Zones would mean disregarding either the positive responses from Zones such as C, E and F or non supportive views expressed by those living in Zone A and the northern Part of Zone B, the majority of whom were against the proposals.
- 5.10 A compromise option is possible that seeks to address the majority views on a street by street basis which involves amending the scheme to reduce its size, whilst still introducing the proposed charging regime. The feedback strongly suggests a general correlation between the distance from the town centre and the desire to pay for a residents parking scheme. i.e. the further from the town centre the resident lives, the less popular the residents parking scheme with charges becomes. It would therefore be possible to remove certain roads from the scheme, whilst maintaining it in roads closer to the town centre. To do this a few basic rules have to be applied:
- If a main through road within a zone is to be included (based on consultation responses), the minor side roads accessed from this main road have to also be included within the zone, regardless of the result of the consultation. (Whilst the side roads may have responded to not be in the zone, they would be at a greater disadvantage if the larger main road was still included and they were not. Excluding them would mean that they could no longer park in the main road but any resident or visitor to the main road could park in the minor side roads).

## Unrestricted

- If a main through road within a zone is to be removed from the scheme, the minor side roads will also be removed from the scheme. (This is to prevent small isolated areas of residents parking that are not included within a zone).
- That an existing road within the scheme will not be split. The entire road will either be included or removed based on the consultation results,. (This will prevent there being neighbours in a street living with different parking conditions).

5.11 Based on the above, the parking scheme can be reduced in size as shown on the plan in Annex B. This shows that Zone A has been removed from the scheme in its entirety, Zone B has been split, with southern residents in the zone and northern residents out of the zone, and Zones C through to F have been included. The roads included within the scheme are listed.

5.12 The table below shows the number of respondents from within the proposed reduced residents parking scheme showing a majority in favour of continuing.

Zone	Against continuing	In favour of continuing
A	-	-
B	32	39
C	2	17
D	37	26
E	9	28
F	12	16
Total	92	126

Table showing the number of responses to question 13 from residents in the reduced Zone (Annex B).

- 5.12 Reducing the scheme as proposed does have a fiscal impact. The original cost estimate for the annual running of the scheme was £104,000 based on a full scheme and with many assumptions. The results of the survey and the proposed changes have necessitated a review of those costs. To run a scheme over a smaller area enables some of the original costs to be reduced, e.g. day to day patrols and printing costs. By changing the approach to in particular how we police the scheme and reducing some back office costs such as printing it is possible to reduce the annual cost of running the scheme from £104k to £64k. Working over a reduced area and by being intelligence led the current enforcement arrangements will be replaced with a more reactive and targeted approach, as seen elsewhere within the Borough. The proposed changes are therefore believed to enable the council to introduce a self funded residents parking scheme on the same level of fees as per the consultation and working to the original assumptions. There will be a need to review the situation post implementation to ensure the overall objectives are still being achieved.
- 5.13 If the proposal is agreed all residents in the original area will be appraised of the decision. They would have the right to make representations in response to the proposed changes to the TRO. Any representations would then be considered as part of the normal adoption process.



## **6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS**

### Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 As an appropriate consultation has been undertaken and considered, no significant legal issues arise from this report.

### Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 There are no direct financial implications inherent in the report. It is intended that the Resident Parking Scheme should be self-funding and both the initial proposal which was sent for consultation and the reduced proposal following the results of the consultation meet this criteria.

### Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.3 Undertaken as part of the trial.

### Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.4 Projecting income for a scheme like this relative to costs is difficult and the charges that have been consulted on could significantly under recover the predicted revised net costs. Whether or not it will be known until full implementation and offer a settling in period. Whilst the overall response rate to the consultation was high for such an exercise, the level of engagement was still less than we would have preferred. As a result the decision to exclude some areas could result in some unmet demand. Should that be the case the Scheme could be extended through use of the Traffic Regulation Order process.

## **7 CONSULTATION**

### Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 The report has been produced taking account of the public consultation involving all residents living in the residents parking trial area.

### Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Direct mail shots and on-line

### Representations Received

- 7.3 Included in the report

### Background Papers

- Residents' Parking Scheme - Bracknell Forest Borough Council (Waiting Restriction and Permit Parking) Order 2014
- Executive report 12 April 2016
- Survey results

Unrestricted

Contacts for further information

Diane Shacklady  
Operational Support Manager  
Telephone: 01344 351251  
Email: [Diane.Shacklady@Bracknell-Forest.gov.uk](mailto:Diane.Shacklady@Bracknell-Forest.gov.uk)

Nick Rose  
Transport Engineering Manager  
Telephone: 01344 351169  
Email: [Nick.Rose@Bracknell-Forest.gov.uk](mailto:Nick.Rose@Bracknell-Forest.gov.uk)