

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLACE

REPORT TO CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

17 JUNE 2010

SHARROW VALE PERMIT PARKING SCHEME – SCHEME REVIEW

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To update the Cabinet Highways Committee with progress on the review of the Sharrow Vale Permit Parking Scheme.
- 1.2 To seek approval to progress various amendments to the parking scheme to address the issues raised during the review

2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report describes the outcome of the public consultation for Traffic Regulation Orders required for the review of the Sharrow Vale permit parking scheme. It also sets out the response to two petitions, one from residents on Cemetery Road about proposed changes within the Permit Parking Scheme and the other concerning free parking in Sharrow Vale local shopping centre. The most significant changes proposed in the TRO were to introduce smaller zones and change the days and times of restrictions within different zones.

3.0 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE PEOPLE OF SHEFFIELD

- 3.1 Consultation with residents and businesses has taken place to develop the changes designed to improve the operation of the Sharrow Vale permit parking scheme. The proposed changes should make it easier to drive through and around the Sharrow Vale area. Responding to requests for additional permit parking bays and longer scheme operational hours should make it easier for residents and businesses in these areas to park nearer their properties.

4.0 OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 4.1 The response to the consultation contributes to the Putting the customer first objective of the Council Plan “A City of Opportunity”, with proposals that respond to customer comments about how to change the existing restrictions within the Sharrow Vale permit parking scheme. In addition, the overall project contributes to the “Reducing Congestion” objective by reducing the availability of longer stay commuter parking in the area. These restrictions encourage individuals to consider more

sustainable forms of transport, including car sharing, thus reducing their carbon footprint.

- 4.2 A key outcome will be the approval to implement amendments to the parking scheme if objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders are resolved.

5.0 BACKGROUND

- 5.1 The Sharrow Vale scheme became fully operational in October 2007 and included the introduction of permit parking, limited waiting parking and waiting restrictions. A general location plan is included as Appendix A. The scheme was designed to improve residents' ability to park near their properties, create a turnover of parking spaces to benefit business customers and visitors to the area, and improve safety by protecting junctions and accesses from being obstructed.

- 5.2 Schemes of this type need to be regularly reviewed to ensure that the restrictions continue to meet the desired objectives of the scheme, while still being practical for the needs of the majority of local residents and businesses.

- 5.3 The review of the scheme was undertaken using a combination of data sources including a questionnaire to residents and businesses, parking surveys and permit holders data.

6.0 QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

- 6.1 Around 7,700 questionnaires were distributed to local residents and businesses in April 2008, together with a pre-paid envelope. The questionnaire was distributed over a wider area than the established scheme boundary. This was to understand how the scheme had affected adjoining areas.

- 6.2 The questionnaires asked a variety of standard questions to help determine how effectively the permit parking scheme was operating.

Questions related to:

- How the scheme had affected the local parking situation
- Whether the scheme included the right balance between residents/business and visitors spaces
- Whether vehicle turnover and enforcement levels were appropriate
- Specific questions relevant to some local areas, and
- A space was also included for respondents to make general comments.

7.0 HOW MANY RESPONSES DID WE RECEIVE?

- 7.1 A total of 1482 responses (19% return rate) were received from residents and businesses. Overall, 65% of responses (963) came from

within the scheme, 35% of responses (519) came from outside the scheme.

- 7.2 The questionnaire responses highlighted around 130 different requests for minor alterations to the scheme. Officers often receive requests for minor changes to the lengths and type of yellow line restrictions or parking bays and the review provides the opportunity to address all of these at the same time.
- 7.3 Around 90% of respondents supplied their home address, giving us a good idea of people's views at a street by street level within the area.
- 7.4 The responses revealed that generally residents and businesses within the area were happy with the scheme, but there a large number of requests for relatively minor changes to the scheme. These requests formed the basis of the changes that are being proposed.
- 7.5 In summary, the proposed changes to the Traffic Regulation Order were intended to:
- deliver around 65% of all requests for minor amendments to the scheme
 - provide more permit holders only bays where needed
 - introduce smaller zones with differing times and days of operation to better reflect local circumstances
 - provide for the Marks and Spencer retail development and the Smart Route proposed on Ecclesall Road by reducing the length of permit bays and changing some longer stay bays to shorter stay bays.
 - allow for the introduction of 'car club' bays in the future

8.0 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER ADVERTISEMENT

- 8.1 The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) containing the amendments was advertised from December 2009 to January 2010. Around 6,500 colour leaflets were distributed to all properties in the area detailing the proposed changes. In addition, street notices were used to make people aware that plans were available for viewing in the Central Library, Howden House and on the Internet.
- 8.2 A total of 199 comments were received from the public. A detailed list of the comments received – and an officer response to each - is included in Appendix B.
- 8.3 The three biggest issues raised, which are covered in detail within this report were:
- Objection to being included in the scheme (61 comments, 53 from Hunter House area)
 - Objection to splitting the scheme up into a larger numbers of smaller zones (30 comments)

- Objection to proposed changes in the scheme operating times/days (29 comments)

9.0 OBJECTIONS TO BEING INCLUDED IN THE SCHEME

9.1 This question was particularly relevant to the Hunter House area, including Hardwick Crescent, Sandbeck Place and parts of Psalter Lane. There were 107 comments and objections to the scheme in this area from 81 households including:

- 53 objections to being in the scheme (7 from Fulmer Road, 8 from Hardwick Crescent, 8 from Hunter House Road, 6 each from Roach Road and Hunter Hill Road, 4 each from Penrhyn Road and Pinner Road and 1 from Junction Road.
- 29 objections to the proposed hours of operation.
- 15 supporting being included within the scheme (4 from Pinner Road, 3 from Junction and Penrhyn Roads, 2 from Hunter House Road and one each from Fulmer Road, Guest Road and Sandbeck Place).
- 22 comments of support to elements of the scheme.

9.2 The objections to being included in the scheme primarily related to:

- Parking not a problem at all so the scheme isn't needed
- Parking a problem at night and weekends when scheme is not proposed
- Scheme will restrict residents
- Problems caused by residents and no other user - there are too many resident cars

9.3 Looking at more detail:

- Sandbeck Place – 5 comments made, two wanted Saturdays and later times, 2 supported inclusion of the road in a scheme
- Junction Road - 5 comments, 3 support inclusion of the road in a scheme, one wanted a scheme on Saturdays and in the evening and one wanted the proposed unrestricted areas removed
- Cowlshaw Road – 1 objection to being included within the scheme, as the main issue was that the main parking problems were not during the proposed schemes operating hours
- Psalter Lane – 5 objections to being included in the scheme (all between Cowlshaw Road and Banner Cross).
- Hardwick Crescent – 8 responses all objecting to being included within the scheme, although there was support for the proposed yellow lines at the end of the Crescent.

- 9.4 From within the Hunter House hillside area, bounded by Hunter House Road, Penrhyn Road and Junction Road, there were 38 objections to be included within the scheme and 12 responses in favour of being included.
- 9.5 However if you look at the results of the original consultation, support for inclusion in the scheme was 48% (100 responses) while those against was 46% (95 responses) and 6% (13) did not respond. In addition a request for including this area in the parking scheme was the subject of an 83 name petition reported to the City Centre, South and East planning and Highways Board in November 2008. In view of the above it is apparent that this area is still split between those who want a scheme and those who do not.
- 9.6 In view of the objections and comments received it is recommended that:
- Junction Road/Cowlshaw Road, Sandbeck Place and Psalter Lane (from Sharrow Vale Road to Cowlshaw Road) should be included in the Porterbrook scheme which operates Monday to Friday, 8.00am – 6.30pm.
 - Hardwick Crescent and Psalter Lane (from Cowlshaw Road towards Banner Cross) should not be included in the scheme, but yellow lines will be implemented where there was support.
 - As a means of resolving the issue of whether to include the Hunter House area a vote be carried out. Each household within the proposed Hunter House scheme will be allowed a single vote to decide whether they want to be included in the parking scheme or remain outside. A simple majority of the votes cast would decide the outcome. It would be made clear to residents that whatever the outcome, the issue would not be revisited for a further three years.
- 9.7 These changes would satisfy 12 of the 53 objections that relate to being included in the scheme. A 'no' vote within the Hunter House area would satisfy a further 38 objections.
- 10.0 OBJECTIONS TO SPLITTING THE SCHEME UP INTO A LARGER NUMBER OF SMALLER ZONES
- 10.1 This question was relevant to all areas. There were 30 objections to this proposal (and one support) from 31 households.
- 10.2 The 30 objections came from the following zones:
- Endcliffe 9
 - Botanical 7
 - Porterbrook 4
 - Unknown 3

- Grange 2
- Hunter House 2
- Landsdowne 2
- Sharrow Vale 1

10.3 The objections related to:

- The need to retain flexibility to find alternative parking spaces (17)
- The loss of the ability to visit other areas in the scheme (5)
- None specific (5)
- House straddles two zones (2)
- The changes would be the cause of confusion (1)

10.4 As can be seen there was very little objection to the actual splitting up of the original parking scheme into smaller zones, each with different hours of operation. The main concern expressed was that permits would no longer be valid in all areas, with maintaining the flexibility to park in other areas being the key concern. It is therefore recommended that the proposed splitting up of the scheme into smaller zones should proceed but that permits remain valid in both the 'home' and adjoining areas to allow some flexibility. The detail of which permits are valid where would be provided to each permit holder in their next permit renewal reminder letters.

10.5 It should be noted that whilst it is intended to extend the hours that permit bays operate into the evenings, which will protect residents' ability to park, the single yellow lines will remain operative up to 6:30pm as now. This allows additional parking, for residents and visitors, on the single yellow lines in the evenings. Therefore the 'zone entry' signs (as shown opposite) will be altered to highlight the local zone name (e.g. 'Botanical') where it currently says 'Sharrow Vale' but the single yellow line restrictions will remain 8.00am -6.30pm on the days that the new zones will operate.



10.6 There may be confusion within the two zones where an evening scheme is being proposed, namely the 'Botanical' and 'Sharrow Vale centre' zones. The 'zone entry' sign would say 'Mon-Sat 8am – 6.30pm', but all the bays (including the pay and display bays) would operate Mon-Sat 8am – 8.30pm. Each bay would be individually signed, but motorists not reading (or understanding) signs may be a problem. It is proposed that this aspect will be monitored and initially warnings issued rather than PCNs and additional signing may be provided if necessary.

10.7 Despite the potential for confusion, it is recommended that all single yellow lines are kept at Mon-Sat 8am – 6.30pm. It is therefore proposed that an awareness raising exercise regarding the meaning of the times on the different signs (including warning notices rather than Penalty Charge Notices) is used in the first two weeks after any bays become operational for a longer time period.

10.8 As there is still the potential for confusion, this change would satisfy 24 out of the 30 objections that relate to splitting the scheme into a larger number of smaller zones.

11.0 OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE SCHEME OPERATING TIMES/DAYS

11.1 This question was particularly relevant to:

- Endcliffe Scheme – where it was proposed to extend the scheme operating hours to 8.30pm, but reduce the days of operation to Monday to Friday
- Grange, Porterbrook and Napier schemes - where it was proposed to reduce the days of operation to Monday to Friday
- Botanical and Sharrow Vale - where it was proposed to extend the scheme operating hours to 8.30pm

11.2 There were 32 objectors and 13 supporters for the changes being proposed as follows:

- 16 objections to the removal of Saturdays, including 14 from the Endcliffe scheme (with 2 responses supporting it) and one from Grange
- 15 objections to the extension of operating times to 8.30pm: 11 from Endcliffe (with 5 supporting it) and 2 from Sharrow Vale centre and 2 from unspecified zones
- 1 objection to the fact that an extension of the schemes operating hours was **not** proposed in the Lansdowne scheme
- 13 comments of support to elements of the scheme, with 10 supporting an evening scheme (5 in Endcliffe, 3 in Botanical and 2 in Sharrow Vale centre).

11.3 In view of the above, it is therefore recommended that

- Endcliffe Scheme – drop the proposed change so that the scheme in this area remains Monday to Saturday, 8.00am-6.30pm as at present.
- Grange, Porterbrook and Napier schemes –reduce the days of operation to Monday to Friday.
- Botanical and Sharrow Vale - extend the scheme operating hours to 8.30pm

- 11.4 It should be noted that the change to Monday to Friday could mean that parts of the Grange scheme become affected by Saturday match day parking, an impact that the current scheme limits. This will be monitored and local feedback after this change is made should make us aware of the nature and extent of any problem. Should it become an issue then this area could be looked at again as part of the proposed review of the Highfield permit parking scheme which will include special match day permits associated with Sheffield United home games.
- 11.5 All of these changes could be facilitated without the need to re advertise any new Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 11.6 These changes would satisfy 26 of the 32 objections that relate to changing the days or times of operation of the scheme.

12.0 OTHER ISSUES RAISED

Sharrow Vale centre

- 12.1 There were 14 responses from this area. (which were generally road specific) and included feedback from Ratcliffe Road, Gordon Road, Stewart Road and Porter Terrace. There were three comments of support for the echelon parking outside the school and one comment made related to the under utilisation of the Stewart Road short stay pay and display car park. No permits can currently be used in this car park. Parking surveys have confirmed that there are always spaces available in the car park. Suggestions about improving its usage include allowing business permit holders access or increasing the current two hour limit to four.
- 12.2 Increasing the current two hour limit to four would need the Traffic Regulation Order to be re advertised in this area. Abuse (through meter feeding – where tickets are replaced through the day) is a already a minor issue in the car park, but a four hour limit in the car park would make this abuse easier. However, there is merit in allowing short stay business permit usage in the car park (up to the maximum two hour limit). Residents can already use the car park at either end of the day as the operational hours are 10.00am to 4.00pm. However, it is unclear whether residents are aware of this facility or not. It could be beneficial for short stay parking for business vehicles which are used on business throughout the day. This change could be implemented through a change in the Terms and Conditions rather than requiring a new TRO.
- 12.3 There was a response made on behalf of a number of local traders within the Sharrow Vale local shopping area. Matters of detail relating to the TRO are dealt with in Appendix B, but some other points raised are considered in more detail in Section 13.

Petition from Cemetery Road residents

- 12.4 An 18 signature petition has been received stating that *'we, the undersigned, want Sheffield City Council to retain permit holder parking*

below 221 Cemetery Road and not return to unrestricted parking that has previously had such a negative impact on residents access to parking in the whole area'

- 12.5 Currently this area is 'shared use' permit and four hour pay and display parking, but the bays are very underutilised during the day. It was therefore proposed to change some of the bays to unrestricted parking to provide some useful long term parking in this area. However the feedback from residents is that this would be a detrimental step.
- 12.6 In view of this it is suggested that rather than unrestricted parking we should provide a 10 hour pay and display/permit bay at this location. This will still allow an element of commuter parking, but with a charge and residents and visitors with permits will still be able to park. The restriction will prevent vehicles from being left there for long periods of time and should result in better use of the available parking.

15 minutes free parking

- 12.7 A free 15 minute parking trial in the Sharrow Vale Road local shopping area was implemented by means of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) in late November 2009. Feedback that we have received has been positive, with a questionnaire to properties in the area leading to 76 responses (52% resident, 47% business, 3%not stating) telling us:
- 57% of respondees 'strongly agreeing' or 'agreeing' that the 15minutes free facility has made it more likely for people to visit their property or business, 20% were not sure. Responses from businesses were more positive than from residents
 - 51% of respondees 'strongly agreeing' or 'agreeing' that the overall parking situation in the area has improved, 15% were not sure. Responses from businesses were more positive than from residents
 - 45% of respondees said that their visitors had commented mainly positively on the trial, while 36% said that they had had no comments at all
 - 15 additional unsolicited positive comments in the 'additional comments' section of the questionnaire
- 12.8 However, there has been one objection to the experimental TRO. It came from Neill Road and was based on the fact that Neill Road was a residential rather than a shopping street. Although the 15 minutes free was introduced to make it easier to access businesses, feedback suggests that it has benefits in a number of other situations including picking up and dropping off at schools, general deliveries to residential properties, very short stay visitor to family and friends. Residents have therefore been just as positive about this trial as local businesses.
- 12.9 It is therefore proposed to make the 15 minutes free parking permanent and extend it throughout the Sharrow Vale Permit Parking area and also introduce it in all other schemes within the Peripheral Parking Zone.

Ecclesall Road Smart Route

- 12.10 Sheffield City Council and South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive are working in partnership to develop proposals to improve travel along Ecclesall Road in Sheffield. These improvements are designed to reduce congestion at key hotspots and junctions, improve the reliability and punctuality of public transport and improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists along the corridor.
- 12.11 The Smart Route's concept brings together a number of separate Council programmes (including bus key routes, congestion, road safety and maintenance) and delivers a single project. It recognises that buses are the most effective way of transporting large numbers of people in busy urban areas, but that some journeys can only be made using the car. Smart Routes aim to strike the balance between improving public transport and tackling congestion for other vehicles.
- 12.12 The Smart Route project developed a number of small proposals along Ecclesall Road which do involve the loss of some parking. Where necessary these proposals have been incorporated into the scheme review TRO. The proposals include:
- the provision of a 'right turn lane' in the middle of the road near Collegiate Crescent (2 parking spaces lost)
 - the extension of the bus stop clearway on the inbound side near Collegiate Crescent (one parking space lost)
 - improvements at the Hunters Bar Roundabout will require a ten metre extension to the existing bus stops (2 parking spaces lost)
- 12.13 In addition, a new pedestrian crossing and access arrangements into the recently approved new Marks and Spencer's development will result in 20 parking spaces being lost, but the scheme review proposed to change around 12 longer stay spaces in the area to short stay, while the new store will include a 65 space car park which will be available to the general public.

13.0 OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM APRIL 2009 MEETING

- 13.1 There were certain issues raised by local businesses which were discussed at the April 2009 Board meeting but not resolved. These are detailed below. In addition local businesses made several comments on the advertised TRO which are dealt with in the spreadsheet as included in Appendix B.

Changing the terms of conditions of the scheme around whether residents permits can be used on Hickmott Road and Sharrow Vale Road (there is already a ban on business permits)

- 13.2 Council Officers were made aware of the difficulties of parking space availability on Sharrow Vale Road (near the Post Office) shortly after the Sharrow Vale scheme started. As a result, in advance of the results of the main scheme review, the loading bay outside the Post

Office was amended to provide six extra temporary pay and display/permit spaces in the area. Feedback from businesses in this area (particularly on Hickmott Road and the section of Sharrow Vale Road between Stewart Road and Jarrow Road) during the review confirmed that spaces for visitors and shoppers in the area are still at a premium and that a relatively small increase to the number of spaces in the area would help. Therefore, the main emphasis of the review was in achieving more short term spaces in the Sharrow Vale Road/Hickmott Road area. This can be achieved in more than one way including:

- Banning the use of residential permits on parts of Sharrow Vale Road. Consideration would have to be given on where these permit holders would then park. On Sharrow Vale Road, between Junction Road and Lynton Road, there are around 120 residential and 70 business properties.
- Further limit the use of business permits on all of (or sections of) roads off Sharrow Vale Road. Surveys have shown that around 25 business permit holders park on Neil Road, four business permits are used on Sharrow Vale Road (between Jarrow Road and Bagshot Street, seven on Eastwood Road, 10 on Stewart Road (currently permit only) and two on Ashford Road. This would help improve the availability of short stay spaces in the area, but not directly in front of the shops. Consideration will be given to road specific business permits which make better use of under utilised bays (such as on Sharrow Vale Road near Westbrook Bank and parts of Wayland Road). However, this would have to be done in discussion with relevant businesses.

13.3 Further (more detailed) parking surveys were undertaken on Sharrow Vale Road in March 2010. The results in the area around Hickmott Road show that a small number of local business people chose to take up parking places which could be used by customers. At the request of local businesses, there is already a ban of the use of business permits on Sharrow Vale Road between Junction Road and Lynton Road and Hickmott Road. However, it is understood that some of the spaces are taken up by some local business people (who also live within the scheme and are consequently entitled to a resident permit), which are not currently banned in this location. This is something that could be done, but at the expense of local residents, and may be unpopular considering that the near by Stewart Road shoppers car park is under used during the day.

13.4 The additional surveys looked in particular at where the residents permit holders who were parking in this area lived. The results were (between Stewart Road and Jarrow Road) two from Sharrow Vale Road, three from Ashford Road, two from Hickmott Road and one from Thompson Road. In the bay opposite 228 Sharrow Vale Road, one resident was from Ashford Road. The numbers from Ashford Road could be due to parking pressures on that road or it could be choice. The review does plan to reduce yellow lines on Ashford Road, creating

two additional spaces on the road. Three extra permit spaces are planned for Ratcliffe Road and (although there have been objections) around seven extra permit spaces on Stewart Road.

- 13.5 In practice, the banning of residential permits in this area would have to be achieved through a change in the TRO. Therefore, in the short term the review includes proposals to increase the number of available pay and display spaces in the area through the TRO as follows:
- formalising the use of the old loading bay near the Post Office as a parking bay
 - a new pay and display/permit bay on Stewart Road - replacing a permit only bay.

- 13.6 Coupled with the other changes to bays highlighted above, it is therefore proposed to re-advertise the TRO in this short section of Sharrow Vale Road (and also on Hickmott Road where restrictions on permit use have already been advertised), with bays being resident permit only before 9.00am and after 5.00pm, but pay and display only during the main working day. Blue badges would still be usable in these bays. The new TRO will be advertised using the delegated powers of the Head of Transport and Highways and should no objections be received, will be implemented. If objections are received, they will be reported back to this Committee.

Whether a clock disc system should be used instead of pay and display machines within the scheme area

- 13.7 Within permit parking schemes, income comes from a variety of sources including:
- Resident permits
 - Business permits
 - Visitors permits
 - Trade permits
 - On street pay and display bays
 - Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs)
- 13.8 In September 2009, Cabinet agreed to reduce permit prices within the Peripheral parking Zone. Using the new lower permit costs as a basis, the combined anticipated income from within the existing Peripheral Parking Zone (around £200,000 per annum) shows that none of the existing schemes cover their on going cost from any one source, with permit income being around 2% of the total, pay and display income being around 50% and PCNs being around 48%. The loss of pay and display machines within permit parking schemes would not only reduce pay and display income, but would make enforcement more difficult and would result in a loss of PCN income. Comparisons of the number of PCNs issued within permit bays in similar areas in schemes with and without pay and display show that show that this reduction could be around 30%, but possibly higher in local shopping centres. Using Sharrow Vale local shopping centre as an example, abuse is up to three times higher than in more residential areas. The loss of PCN

income could be off set by charging a one off payment for a clock disc, but would need to be set at a price of £5 each (and 30,000 sold each year) in order for the figures to balance but clock discs would last several years for regular visitors to the area. A clock disc scheme would reduce the direct cost of meter servicing, which would be around £80,000 per year.

13.9 In addition, a number of other authorities who currently make use of clock discs have been contacted. A brief summary of their comments included below:

- Harrogate:
 - Disc parking not used in main commercial areas
 - Used in small district centres (on street) such as Knaresbrough and Ripon but there are small pay and display parking areas too

- Scarborough:
 - Do use clock discs in a local shopping areas, but have a fixed maximum stay of 1 hour
 - Their view is that the disc system is more likely to be abused than pay and display
 - Enforcement of a clock disc system is seen as a more time consuming process
 - Do not use disc parking in the town centre

- Carlisle:
 - Free on street disc parking in City Centre, but have a fixed maximum stay of 1 hour. 14 off street pay and display car parks providing both long stay and short stay parking opportunities
 - Disc system used to control the duration of parking so that shoppers and others with short term business in the City Centre could find a space and anyone wishing to park for a long period would be forced to use a car park.
 - Local residents soon learned how it worked, although visitors easily get confused: visitors cannot believe parking is free and can be confused about where to get discs.
 - System does get abused: main problem is people returning to their cars to change the time of arrival shown on the disc without moving the car. It is a problem particularly around the schools and colleges where students pop out between lectures to alter the discs.

13.10 Finally, as part of the review of the Sharrow Vale Permit Parking scheme the Council commissioned CELLO **mr**uk research to conduct a survey to evaluate the scheme since its inception which included a question relating to the cost of visitor parking. 97% of visitors interviewed on street felt 20p per hour for parking was about the right price. 94% of businesses interviewed also felt that 20p per hour for

parking was about the right price. The same research project revealed that the numbers of visitors who found it 'fairly difficult' or 'very difficult' to park either on Ecclesall Road or within the Sharrow Vale local shopping area decreased from 81% to 49% after the schemes introduction in October 2007. This shows a significant increase in the proportion of visitors who now find it easy to park compared to prior to October 2007.

- 13.11 In summary, although clock disc systems can work successfully, they are more prone to abuse than a system that uses pay and display. In addition, market research has show that visitors to (and businesses within) the area feel that the 20p per hour cost for parking was 'about the right price'. Although there are reductions in the ongoing 'maintenance' costs of the pay and display machines, the associated loss of pay and display and PCN income would mean that the schemes would simply not meet their costs. Income could reduce by around £620,000 (£470,000 from Pay and Display and £150,000 from PCNs). With an existing permit parking surplus of £199,000 (and presuming no charge for a clock disc but allowing for the £80,000 direct cost savings associated with the removal of the need for pay and display meter servicing) this request could lead to a loss of around £340,000.
- 13.12 It is therefore recommended that the Council continue providing cheap, short stay pay and display parking within the PPZ supported by free parking up to 15 minutes in pay and display bays rather than adopting a clock system.

Confirming our existing stance on enabling businesses to obtain more than two permits

- 13.13 One of the aims of the permit-parking scheme is to make parking easier for visitors to local businesses and shoppers. Tighter restrictions on business permit use were therefore introduced following requests from the business community – and endorsed at Area Board - on 19 March 2007.
- 13.14 It was always anticipated that some businesses would require additional business permits to allow them to carry out their day-to-day operations. A procedure for assessing the provision of additional permits was developed. This procedure aims to assess the travel needs of a business and provide additional permits where necessary, based upon a set of criteria that provides an understandable, consistent and fair outcome. The procedure takes several key factors into account, which are detailed below:
- The quantity of private off-street parking in relation to current Unitary Development Plan (UDP) car parking standards
 - The willingness to become involved in a travel plan (larger businesses only)
 - Demonstration of an operational need for additional permits

- The availability of public transport and unrestricted parking opportunities.
- 13.15 Should a business currently have more private parking than would be permitted under current UDP guidelines, then the request for additional permits may be refused. If private parking is below current UDP standards, the Council will consider the provision of permits up to the number that would be permitted under current UDP standards. More permits than the UDP standard may be granted initially to allow businesses to reorganize parking operations with their staff, then reduced over time.
- 13.16 Experience from other authorities (highlighted through an external review of the Sharrow vale permit parking scheme) has shown that charges alone are not an effective regulator of demand. Many schemes around the country have adopted absolute limits to the number of business permits issued, usually within the range of 2-4. The current approach (as set out in paragraph 13.14) in Sheffield is more flexible than this.
- 13.17 It is recommended that this more pragmatic approach is maintained

Confirming how students in multiple occupancy housing are dealt with in densely parked areas

- 13.18 The current policy within permit parking schemes is to treat houses of multiple occupancies (mainly, but not solely students) as local residents, where by there is no cost differential in permits and the numbers of permits are limited in the same way that they are in the more settled population. Research among other larger authorities has highlighted that this stance (rather than allowing a permit for every vehicle of a resident at an address) is already among the strictest in the country. However, it should be noted that few cities operate a similarly extensive PPZ to that in Sheffield.
- 13.19 The perception is that student houses do cause significant problems in the area. Surveys in the Hickmott Road shopping area (during term time) have shown that resident parking on Eastwood Road, Bruce Road and Neill Road accounted for about half of its capacity, but as low as 25% – excluding unrestricted parking areas - on Bruce Road. These surveys show that there are still parking opportunities for people visiting the area. The basic restriction to two permits and the increased cost of an additional permit does provide a further disincentive for students bringing their vehicles into the area. The Council's records show that there are only a small number of properties in this area with two permits. There are none with more than two.
- 13.20 Research through our 'external review' has provided evidence that one authority seeks to exclude students from residents permit issue by insisting that the details of the vehicle's registered keeper correspond to the term time address being used for eligibility to the residents'

scheme. The experience there has been extremely negative in terms of dealing with a major element of the on street parking demand and simply resulted in unwanted displacement of student parking to adjoining areas. It is therefore felt to be better to have an inclusive treatment for students.

- 13.21 Therefore, it is recommended that we continue to treat students in the same as other householders in the area in that the permit allocation criteria is the same.

Confirming the status of the request for the one way system on Eastwood Road, part of Bruce Road and Neill Road

- 13.22 This request was made to ease some of the vehicle conflicts that exist on these narrow streets. It was also raised (as well as short cutting traffic through Neill Road and Eastwood Road) as a safety issue through the TRO consultation.
- 13.23 One-way operation could lead to an increase in traffic volumes on these roads, if drivers seek to avoid the busier Ecclesall Road/Hickmott Road junction. Although the lack of vehicle 'conflict' could also lead to higher speeds, the high volume of parked cars could also act as a deterrent to speeding. It is likely that the area would have to be traffic calmed to keep speeds low.
- 13.24 Speeding on residential roads is a concern regularly raised by residents all over the City. Unless it is being implemented through a planning condition, traffic calming to help enforce lower speeds has been prioritised in residential areas of the City where there is a history of child road accidents and therefore where children are most at risk in the future. Since April 2010 the budget responsibility for area wide speed calming has been passed to Community Assemblies. Therefore, the proposal for traffic calming connected to a one way scheme will be passed to the Central Community Assembly for consideration.

Confirming the status of the existing permit parking strategy

- 13.25 Any major change of parking policy such as this would need to be referred to the full Cabinet for a decision. There is currently no changes proposed to the way that permit parking schemes are (and will) operate, as a review of existing parking policy is not currently a Council priority. Charging for car parking in the area provides for:
- Better management of available space to meet local needs and support the vitality and viability of the local shopping area;
 - Users paying for the 'service' of provision and management of car parking;
 - A good link with national and local policy on reducing car usage and encouraging sustainable alternative modes;
- 13.26 However, a balance needs to be struck between residents (who generally like the changes that the scheme brings) and some

businesses (who see the schemes as reducing the attractiveness of the local shopping areas), despite parking opportunities actually increasing and independent research with London Road traders showing that they over emphasise the amount of their customers arriving by car.

13.27 Parking restrictions form a complementary tool to other aspects of the Council Transport strategy, which ultimately aims to improve alternatives to the single occupancy private car trip, thus reducing congestion which costs both residents and businesses a significant amount through lost time. As such, there is no current intention to review the policy of having the PPZ, but the scheme reviews give opportunity to amend the restrictions within the zone, taking care to balance the needs of residents, businesses and visitors to the area.

14.0 PROPOSED CHANGES

14.1 Consideration has been given to all the comments received during the TRO consultation and as a result many changes have been proposed. These are generally of a minor nature such as reducing yellow lines and providing additional parking spaces, but there is a need to re-advertise a number of changes too. All the changes are set out in the drawings numbered TR – BG259 R2 available in Appendix C, at the meeting and in the Member's library. The text in red relates to the original proposals as advertised in the Traffic Regulation Order consultation. The text in blue relates to the changes made as a result of the Traffic Regulation Order consultation.

14.2 A summary plan showing the revised scheme boundaries and operating days and times is included in Appendix D.

15.0 TAXIS

15.1 Although additional ranking facilities have been provided within the City Centre, there has not been a proportional increase in ranking facilities elsewhere. If the Council does not have designated ranks in appropriate locations the taxis will rank informally (and potentially inappropriately) elsewhere. This already occurs on a regular basis along Ecclesall Road in particular near the junction with Collegiate Crescent. The only locations where taxis can currently rank in close proximity to the many popular pubs and restaurants that create the demand for them, are those left vacant by private vehicles. In general these are where parking is restricted, such as double yellow lines (generally around junctions) and at bus stops and these are inappropriate locations causing danger and inconvenience to other road users. The Highway Authority clearly needs to balance the conflicting requirements of all highway users, including those of taxis and their customers in an area where road space is at a premium. As a taxi licensing authority, it could be difficult to enforce illegal ranking without providing sufficient legal ranks. However, there is clear demand for taxi facilities.

- 15.2 As part of an independent review of Taxi Rank provision in Sheffield several locations were identified within the Sharrow Vale area which could benefit from the introduction of small, generally two space, Taxi Ranks. As part of the Marks and Spencer's retail development, the only official taxi rank on the whole of Ecclesall Road will be lost where demand for taxis is extremely high, particularly at night.
- 15.3 A total of ten small evening taxi ranks were proposed: eight on Ecclesall Road, two on Sharrow Vale Road.
- 15.4 In terms of Sharrow Vale Road, there were objections to the Taxi Ranks outside the Lescar pub (but none for the proposed rank outside the Porter Cottage).
- 15.5 There has been a blanket objection to all ranks on Ecclesall Road, with the 3.00am end time being cause for particular concern. It is assumed that the objectors believe that taxis will rank until 3.00am. However, the taxis will only use a rank when there is demand. If the venue adjacent to the rank closes at 11.30pm, then the rank will be unused shortly after this time. If the same venue is open until 0.30am on a Saturday then the rank will be vacated when demand ceases. In short, the rank will only be used if there is demand. However, it is considered that a consistent end time in the area will avoid confusion for all.
- 15.6 It is worth noting that it is Planning and Licensing permissions, not taxi ranks times that ultimately determine how late taxis operate in the area.
- 15.7 Although individual sites have been reassessed, it is proposed to over rule the general objections on the basis of proven demand and seeking to promote safe facilities that limited adverse impacts on other road users and implement the ranks as shown in the plans in Appendix C. However, looking at existing planning and licensing permissions a consistent end time of 2.30am rather than 3.00am will be progressed.
- 16.0 CAR CLUB SPACES
- 16.1 The Council has facilitated the establishment of a 'Car Club' which provides cars for hire by the hour to members of the public. The Car Club, was launched in April 2007 with cars available at four City Centre locations. An experimental Car Club bay was introduced on Sharrow Vale Road in September 2008 and – as there have been no objections to the bay – will be made permanent. Efforts are being made to identify suitable locations for additional Car Club spaces and when identified a small number of parking bays will be reserved for sole use of Car Club vehicles.

17.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

17.1 The scheme review has cost £60,000 to date, made up primarily of surveys (£35,000), scheme design costs (£22,000) and the costs of producing and distributing publicity (£3,000). This figure has been funded through the South Yorkshire wide Central 'Local Transport Plan' Integrated Transport allocation. It is expected that the changes to signing and lining in the area could cost up to a further £150,000 to implement (including changes to signing to lining in the area, approximately £65,000), staff time (approximately £85,000). This figure – again funded through the South Yorkshire wide Central 'Local Transport Plan' Integrated Transport allocation for 2010/11 – was approved at Cabinet as part of the Corporate Plan report on 17th February 2010.

18.0 EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

18.1 We have completed an Equality Impact Assessment (attached) and there are no particular equal opportunities implications directly arising from the contents of this report. It has also highlighted the benefits of promoting facilities that are already available within the scheme.

19.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

19.1 There are no specific legal implications arising from the contents of this report.

20.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

20.1 The scheme is intended to contribute to reducing the environmental impact of cars by encouraging longer stay commuter journeys to be made in other more sustainable ways.

21.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

21.1 That the report on the on the results of the Sharrow Vale permit parking scheme are noted.

21.2 That all minor changes highlighted in red and blue text in the plans included in Appendix C be approved and implemented.

21.3 That Junction Road/Cowlshaw Road, Sandbeck Place and Psalter Lane (from Sharrow Vale Road to Cowlshaw Road) should be included in the Porterbrook scheme which operates Monday to Friday, 8.00am – 6.30pm.

21.4 That Hardwick Crescent and Psalter Lane (from Cowlshaw Road towards Banner Cross) should not be included in any permit parking scheme, but yellow lines be implemented where there was support.

- 21.5 That a vote be carried out to resolve the issue of whether to include the Hunter House area in a permit parking scheme. Each household within the proposed Hunter House scheme will be allowed a single vote to decide whether they want to be included in the parking scheme or remain outside. A simple majority of the votes cast would decide the outcome. It would be made clear to residents that whatever the outcome, the issue would not be revisited for a further three years.
- 21.6 That the proposed splitting up of the Sharrow Vale scheme into smaller zones should proceed but that residents and business permits should be valid in the 'home' and adjoining zones.
- 21.7 That all 'zone entry' signs for the new zones would say 'Mon-Sat 8am – 6.30pm', but all the bays in the Botanical and Sharrow Vale zones (including the pay and display bays) would operate Mon-Sat 8am – 8.30pm, with an awareness raising exercise regarding the meaning of the times on the different signs (including warning notices rather than Penalty Charge Notices) is used in the first two weeks after any bays become operational for a longer time period.
- 21.8 That the Endcliffe Scheme remains Monday to Saturday, 8.00am-6.30pm as at present.
- 21.9 That the Grange, Porterbrook and Napier schemes are reduced to operate Monday to Friday only.
- 21.10 That the Botanical and Sharrow Vale schemes operate later into the evenings, to 8.30pm.
- 21.11 That – in response to a petition from the residents of Cemetery Road - 10 hour shared use pay and display/permit bay rather than unrestricted parking be used at this location.
- 21.12 That the 15 minutes free parking trial throughout the Sharrow Vale local shopping area be made permanent as well as rolling it out across the Sharrow Vale (and all other) schemes within the PPZ.
- 21.13 That short stay business permit usage be allowed in the Stewart Road car park (up to the maximum two hour limit) through a change in Terms and Conditions.
- 21.14 That the TRO on a short section of Sharrow Vale Road (and also on Hickmott Road where restrictions on permit use have already been advertised), be re-advertised with bays being resident permit only before 9.00am and after 5.00pm, but pay and display only during the main working day. The new TRO will be advertised using the delegated powers of the Head of Transport and Highways and should no objections be received, will be implemented. If objections are received, they will be reported back to this Committee.

- 21.15 That the Council continue providing cheap, short stay pay and display parking within the PPZ supported by free parking up to 15 minutes in pay and display bays rather than adopting a clock based system.
- 21.16 That the Council continue to use the established approach to business permit allocation
- 21.17 That the Council do not propose to change the way that permit parking schemes are (and will) operate, as a review of existing parking policy is not currently a Council priority
- 21.18 That the general objections to taxi ranks be overruled and new ranks (from 6.30pm to 2.30am) be implemented as shown in Appendix C.
- 21.19 That the experimental Car Club bay introduced on Sharrow Vale Road be made permanent

John Bann
Head of Transport and Highways
17 June 2010