

Cttee	<b>Cabinet</b>
Date	<b>8 July 2008</b>
Report By	<b>Director of Transport and Environment</b>
Title of Report	<b>Eastbourne Parking (Results of Preliminary consultation)</b>
Purpose of Report	<b>To consider the possible publication of draft Orders.</b>

---

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1. To approve the publication of draft Orders for the purposes of the statutory consultation;**
  - 2. To delegate to the Director of Transport and Environment authority to decide whether or not to make the necessary Orders having considered the results of the consultation, and any recommendations made by the Planning Committee;**
  - 3. To delegate to the Director of Transport and Environment, in the event of any Orders being made under recommendation 2 above and Civil Parking Enforcement powers be granted, authority to approve the publication of such draft Orders as necessary to ensure that any Orders made under recommendation 2 above are compliant with the Traffic Management Act 2004.**
- 

**1 Financial Appraisal**

1.1 On-street parking schemes should be financially self-sufficient and I am satisfied that this scheme would be capable of being operated in such a way as to satisfy that requirement. The financial implications of implementing the scheme were reported to the Lead Member for Transport and Environment following his decision to take a preferred scheme to public consultation, there has been no material change in that assessment.

**2 Supporting Information**

2.1 On 8 February 2008, Lead Member for Transport and Environment agreed to continue towards the implementation of the scheme and, in particular, to initiate consultations; to invite the Borough Council to participate in the development of the scheme and to liaise with the Department for Transport in respect of the Council's application for decriminalised (now civil) enforcement powers.

2.2 Details of the consultation process are set out in Appendix A. As part of the consultation letters were sent to 59 stakeholder organisations whose members might possibly be affected by the Orders and whom it was considered appropriate to consult. These stakeholder organisations included the Borough Council, the Police, the Fire and Ambulance authorities, the four local bus operators, the Freight Transport Association (FTA) and the Road Haulage Association (RHA). Letters seeking people's views on localised changes to the layout of the controls in certain roads were sent to 664 addresses.

2.3 In order to ensure that as many as practicable of those likely to be affected were aware of the consultation and had the opportunity to comment, letters were delivered to every address within the area of the existing town centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and in immediately surrounding streets (approximately 6000 letters). Similar information was available on the Council's website and the consultation was well covered in the local media. A telephone helpline was publicised for anyone wishing to discuss the proposals; a freepost address was publicised for responses by letter and a dedicated email address for anyone wishing to respond electronically. The consultation was further publicised by opponents of the proposals who organised petitioning campaigns apparently covering the whole Borough.

2.4 The Borough Council has agreed to participate in joint management arrangements to oversee

the development of the scheme and other appropriate matters, although County Council officers have expressed concern about the level of the Borough's proposed representation.

2.5 Officials at the Department for Transport have recently advised that they have agreed in principle for the County Council to proceed with its application for Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) excluding the Borough Council's car parks. The County Council will now resubmit its application but until such time as the powers are granted, any traffic orders would have to be drafted to enable enforcement to take place under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 rather than the Traffic Management Act 2004. The potential impacts of this are set out in Appendix B. Should the application for CPE be successful it would be necessary to make amendments to any Orders that are made Orders prior to CPE being granted, and I am seeking delegated authority to address this.

### **3. Consideration**

3.1 The closing date for responses to the consultation was Monday 19 May 2008 but any received after that date (until the time of finalising this report) have been considered. Copies of all consultation materials and responses are available for inspection in the Members' Room. All responses irrespective of whether they were received from addresses within the CPZ or not, were considered. An analysis of the 17 responses received from the 15 stakeholder organisations which responded (three responses were received from the Borough Council), are set out in Appendix C. An analysis of the 241 letters and e-mails received from other individuals are set out in Appendix D. In addition, 5394 petition slips collected by Eastbourne and Willingdon Liberal Democrats were received and were presented to Council on 20 May. The great majority of these were from outside the area of the CPZ. More detail about the petition is contained in Appendix A.

3.2 In addition to the consultation on the overall proposals, a total of 214 reply slips were received in response to localised consultations on proposed modifications to the layout of the parking controls in certain roads. An analysis of the responses to these localised consultations and resulting recommendations is set out in Appendix E.

3.3 Recommendations about modifications to the proposals in response to the comments that have been received are set out in Appendix C, D and E and these will assist in constructing Orders in such a way as to reflect, as far as possible and, where appropriate, local community preferences.

3.4 An issue which has been raised in a number of responses to the consultation, including the joint response submitted by the Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Small Businesses and the Hospitality Association, is the need to introduce other measures which would complement the introduction of the Parking Scheme and help to mitigate some of its impacts. It is fundamental for the transport strategy for the area that the parking scheme should be part of a comprehensive package. Progress with the introduction of these complementary measures is set out in Appendix F.

### **4. Conclusions and Reasons for Recommendations**

4.1 The consultation reveals wide recognition of the need for more effective enforcement. Whilst some respondents support or substantially support the proposed package of measures, others are opposed to pay to park in principle; a number would prefer enforcement of existing regulations without charges and others argue that new controls should only be introduced as part of a wider transport strategy. A decision about whether to introduce parking controls must be made on traffic, transport, environment and amenity grounds as set out in Appendix G, which addresses the legal considerations relating to a decision to promote a traffic order. Having considered all these responses against those legal considerations I consider on balance that no significant issue has been raised that should lead to the Council departing from its proposals to introduce these new controls. Cabinet will also recall that these issues were also considered in February 2008 by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment and the present consultation process has introduced no new significant issues. Cabinet will also be aware of the further opportunity for objections to be made to the proposed orders as part

of the statutory consultation and these will be considered by the Planning Committee. In the light of these points and the more detailed consideration of specific responses set out in Appendices C, D and E, I recommend that Orders should be prepared and advertised.

4.2 I recommend that, for the reason set out in the report and appendices that draft Orders should be advertised. In the absence of a decision about the Council's application for Civil Parking Enforcement powers these Orders should be drafted to permit enforcement under powers contained in the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act. Any Orders which were then made would be amended if Civil Parking Enforcement Powers were granted.

RUPERT CLUBB

Director of Transport and Environment

Contact Officer: John Robbins Tel 01273 482236

Local Members: Councillors Elkin, Harris, Healy, Lacey, Skilton, Taylor, Tunwell, Tutt and Woodall

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

## **Preliminary Consultation on the Eastbourne Parking Proposals.**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1 This Appendix sets out the details of the preliminary consultation process and of a petition presented to the Council on 20 May 2008.

### **2. The Preliminary Consultation Process**

2.1 Following the decision of the Lead Member for Transport and Environment on 8 February 2008 to continue towards the implementation of the Eastbourne Parking Scheme, the County Council has undertaken a preliminary consultation on the proposals. The procedure for making Traffic Orders is set out in The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (The 1996 Procedure Regulations). These set out various requirements that must be met prior to making an Order, including whom the authority should consult.

2.2 In common with established practice, the County Council undertakes a two stage consultation process involving both a preliminary and a formal consultation. This is despite the fact that the 1996 Procedure Regulations only require the formal consultation stage. The purpose of the preliminary consultation is to identify any major concerns that people have with the principles underlying the scheme or its design and operation. The information received during the informal consultation stage is used to both inform a decision about whether the Council should proceed to formal consultation on draft Orders and to refine the content of the Order.

2.3 The preliminary consultation exercise was initiated on 18 April 2008. The consultation was open to anyone and information about the consultation was circulated in the following ways:

- a circular letter was hand delivered to over 6000 residential and business addresses inside the town centre CPZ and the roads immediately around it;
- letters seeking people's views on localised changes to the layout of the controls in certain roads were sent to 664 addresses in the CPZ;
- letters seeking the views of key stakeholders on the proposals were sent to 51 organisations including the emergency services, the Borough Council, business groups, freight transport organisations, public transport operators and groups representing people with disabilities.
- a press release was issued about the consultation which generated coverage in the local press and on local radio;
- information about the consultation was available on the County Council's website including copies of maps showing the proposed layout of the controls
- a telephone helpline was publicised for anyone wishing to discuss the proposals;
- a freepost address was publicised for responses by letter and a dedicated email address for anyone wishing to respond electronically.
- The consultation was further publicised by opponents of the proposals who organised petitioning campaigns apparently covering the whole Borough.

2.4 I consider that this approach was rational and reasonable in the context of the requirements of the 1996 Procedure Regulations which require the Council "to take such other steps as it may consider appropriate for ensuring that adequate publicity about the order is give to persons likely to be affected by its provisions". Information was delivered to those living and having businesses in the area affected with those outside the area having access to the same information and the opportunity to comment through the website and other publicity.

2.5 The closing date for responses to the consultation was Monday 19 May 2008 but any received after that date have been considered. A total of 67 consultation letters were sent out to 59

stakeholder organisations (multiple letters were sent to some organisations). At the time of writing, a total of 17 responses have been received from 15 stakeholder organisations (three responses were received from the Borough Council). The issues raised by these stakeholders are set out in Appendix C. A further 241 letters and e-mails were received from other individuals, 72 percent of which were from outside the existing Controlled Parking Zone. The main issues raised by these individuals and the resulting recommendations about modifications to the proposals are set out in Appendix D.

### **3. Petition**

3.1 On 20 May 2008, 5394 petition slips collected by Eastbourne and Willingdon Liberal Democrats were received and were presented to Council. The great majority of these were from outside the area of the CPZ.

3.2 All the petition slips have been considered as responses to the current consultation. However a significant proportion of them appear to have been cut from a leaflet that was produced many months before the consultation began and are addressed to the Secretary of State rather than to the County Council. It should also be noted that material from which the remaining petition slips appear to have been cut, contained information that was factually incorrect. Nevertheless, the petition slips do show that a number of people, when urged to do so, supported the proposition that the County Council should “stop ... plans [for ‘pay to park’] and instead take action against illegal parking - without taxing local people”. Many of the individual responses were in similar vein.

### **4. Localised consultations**

4.1 A total of 214 reply slips were received in response localised consultations on proposed modifications to the layout of the parking controls in certain roads. An analysis of the responses to these localised consultations and resulting recommendations is set out in Appendix E.

## **A comparison of enforcement in Eastbourne with and without Civil Parking Enforcement Powers**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1 This appendix sets out how the enforcement of the parking regulations would differ with and without the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) powers in the Borough.

### **2. Background**

2.1 On 11 July 2006, Cabinet resolved to apply to the Secretary of State for Transport for the powers to introduce decriminalised parking enforcement (DPE) in Eastbourne and an application was duly made. Under the Traffic Management Act 2004, from March 2008 DPE changed slightly and will become known as Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE).

2.2 The introduction of CPE in Eastbourne would involve the transfer of the responsibility for enforcing on-street parking regulation from the Police to Civil Enforcement Officers acting on behalf of the County Council.

2.3 The Council's application has met all the technical criteria but the Minister responsible for considering the applications deferred a decision to allow discussions to take place between the County Council and the Borough Council on the possibility of identifying a joint way forward. Those discussions have concluded and officials from the Department for Transport have recently advised that the Minister has agreed, in principle, that the County Council can proceed with its application for CPE without the inclusion of the Borough Council's off street car parks.

2.4 The County Council will now have to resubmit its application to reflect the change from DPE to CPE. This application will have to be considered and approved by the Secretary of State.

2.5 It is important to emphasise that the decision to introduce controls on the ground is not tied to the Secretary of State's decision about whether to grant CPE. The new controls can be introduced with or without CPE. However, the advantages of CPE are overwhelming and if it is decided to proceed with the publication of draft Orders we will continue with the application process for CPE.

2.6 In the absence of CPE powers, enforcement would have to continue to take place under the powers contained in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984). From the perspective of the motorist there would be little practical difference. However, enforcement under the RTRA 1984 would rather be less effective and less efficient. Despite this the benefits of introducing the new controls on the ground would still be substantial.

### **3. Enforcement under Civil Parking Enforcement Powers**

3.1 Under a CPE regime the County Council would be responsible for enforcing all of the parking restriction across the entire Borough. Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) provided by the County Council's enforcement contractor (NCP Services) would be able to issue a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) to any vehicle contravening the parking regulations regardless of whether the contravention took place in a permitted parking bay (pay and display and permit holder bays) or in a single or double yellow line. Enforcement would not be restricted to the town centre Controlled Parking Zone with the yellow lines that exist across the entire Borough being enforced by the CEOs. All of the income received from pay and display charges and PCNs would be retained by the County Council.

An appeal process exists for those wishing to contest the issuing of a parking ticket with the opportunity to attend a hearing with an independent parking adjudicator.

#### **4 Enforcement under the 1984 RTRA**

4.1 Under the 1984 RTRA parking attendants operating on behalf of the County Council would be able to issue Excess Charge Notices to vehicles that either fail to purchase a parking ticket or display a permit or stay for longer than the time they have purchased in any of the permitted parking bays. Someone in receipt of an ECN would either have the option to pay the excess charge within a defined period or face prosecution through the courts for non payment.

4.2 The essential difference between a CPE and Non CPE regime is that parking attendants would not be able to issue Penalty Charge Notices to vehicles illegally parked on single and double yellow lines. As parking on single and double yellow lines constitutes a criminal offence, the County Council would either be reliant on the Police to enforce these yellow line contraventions or on having the parking attendants issue Notices of Intended Prosecution to these vehicles. The Notices of Intended Prosecution would inform the driver of the vehicle of the County Council's intention to prosecute them but would not in itself require them to pay a fine. Action would be taken to prosecute them through the courts which could result in them being fined and the County Council having to apply for the costs associated with bringing the prosecution.

4.3 Any income received from a Fixed Penalty Notice issued by the Police or a fine following a court action would go to the Exchequer. Any court action resulting from non payment of an Excess Charge Notice would result in payment of the original excess charge to the County Council plus the possibility of an additional fine, which would go to the Exchequer.

4.4 Essentially whether the enforcement take place under CPE powers or not those contravening parking regulations face the treat of sanctions being imposed on them. However, no one body has overall responsibility for parking enforcement and the procedure for making representations against parking tickets and notices would vary.

**Analysis of responses from stakeholder organisations**

Organisation	Summary of comments and issues raised	Consideration	Recommendations
Eastbourne and Country Taxis (L133)	Support the Proposals as lack of control on use of parking in town centre makes it difficult for shoppers, visitors to find spaces. Concerned about introduction of additional loading restrictions in Cornfield Road, Gildredge Road, Marine Parade (outside Travel Lodge) and Ashford Road and impact on ability to pick up and set down passengers, particularly the elderly and those with disabilities.	Additional loading restrictions have been introduced on the approaches to junctions and on corners where parked vehicles would represent a danger to other users and obstruct traffic flow. Additional loading restrictions have been introduced on sections of the main traffic routes in the town centre to maintain the free flow of traffic at all times.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.
Wealden District Council (L132) & (L83)	No comments to make at this time		
Holy Trinity Church (L131) & (E65)	Do not support the proposals. Most parishioners live outside town centre and travel by car. Pay to park will affect church activities held across the week when charges would operate. Charges will affect business at coffee and gift shop in Trinity Place.	The parking charges would not operate on a Sunday (other than on the seafront). Volunteers working for faith based organisations delivering services to residents in the town centre are eligible for Voluntary Sector Worker permits issued at no charge to the organisation.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.
Brighton and Hove Buses (L129)	Support the proposals. Concerned about the impact of Blue Badge Holders parking on single and double yellow lines	Additional loading restrictions have been introduced to keep the main traffic routes in the town centre free from obstruction. Blue Badge Holders are not able to park where these restriction are in place. The number of Blue Badge spaces has been increased and Blue Badge Holders would be able to park in pay and display bays and shared use bays with out charge and without time limit. Improved enforcement would free up more space in these bays for all users including Blue Badge Holders.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.

Organisation	Summary of comments and issues raised	Consideration	Recommendations
Freight Transport Association (E121)	Provision for loading appears OK. Enforcement protocol needs to take account of deliveries to pubs particularly those located at busy junctions where parking and loading is not permitted. For security reasons Cash-in-transit vehicles need to stop for short periods of time close to their destination. Their needs must be taken in account in enforcement protocol.	The enforcement protocol that would operate in the town would take account of these needs to ensure that the loading and unloading requirements of specific businesses can continue to be accommodated.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.
Eastbourne Ratepayers Association (E120)	Before CPZ is introduced there must be an adequate bus service, cycle lanes must be updated, standard of off street car parks must be improved, and action must be taken by Head Teachers to reduce the number of children being driven to school. Heath and care workers should not have to pay to park	The County Council is currently in the process of introducing a number of Quality Bus Corridors on arterial routes into the town. Bus priority improvements are being introduced on these routes to reduce bus journey times and improve reliability. A Real Time Bus Information system was also introduced in 2007 which provides up to the minute information about bus arrival times on special signs at bus stops. The County Council, in partnership with the Borough Council, is continuing to look into the possibility of providing a park and ride service for the town. Further improvements to the operation of bus services are being pursued through a Quality Bus Partnership. The County Council, in partnership with business organisations, is in discussions with the private off-street car par operators in the town concerning the quality of their car parks. The County Council develops school travel plans with schools across the county with the aim of reducing the number of children being driven to school. The charges for	To note the comments and respond as indicated.
Road Haulage Association (E119)	There must be adequate provision for loading and unloading facilities in any proposals which should be as close as possible to premises to ensure the health and safety of those making the deliveries and the general public	As part of the introduction of the new controls dedicated goods vehicle loading only bays have been provided in streets fronted by commercial premises.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of comments and issues raised</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<p>Cllr David Tutt, Leader of Eastbourne Borough Council (E114) (L136) (L130)</p>	<p>Objects to "pay to park" proposals. Balance of 4:1 local opinion opposes. Businesses and hoteliers do not support the proposals. Businesses fear losing staff. Consultation is limited to those in the proposed charging area. Resident's permits do not guarantee a parking space. Parking charges will be an additional financial burden to residents and businesses are a stealth tax. County Council has failed to listen. Borough Council opposed to the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement. Parking enforcement can be achieved without pay to park.</p>	<p>Joint response from Federation of Small Businesses, Hospitality Association and Chamber of Commerce does not state their opposition to the proposals. The consultation has not been limited to those in the affected area. Anybody has been able to comment on the proposals. The Council has taken reasonable steps to inform those in properties directly affected about the proposals. Just because someone has not received a circular letter does not mean that they haven't been consulted. The consultation material was available on the County Council's website and the freepost address for response was published in the press. As a result, many people from outside the area have responded to the consultation. The County Council has never stated that a resident's permit would guarantee a parking space. The parking charges are necessary to raise the revenue to pay for the cost of enforcing the regulations. The County Council has listened to the views of residents and businesses and has developed a scheme which takes account of those views. The Borough Council's response is at odds with their own proposal to introduce parking charges in their Hyde Gardens off street car park on a Sunday. The Borough Council is yet to demonstrate how a satisfactory level of parking enforcement can be achieved without the introduction of parking charges.</p>	<p>To note the comments and respond as indicated.</p>

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of comments and issues raised</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Cllr Andrew Goodwin, Eastbourne Borough Council (L127)	Objects to proposals as unfair to tourists, disabled drivers and residents. Charities will have to close as a result of parking charges. Charges will deter tourists. Enforcement should be undertaken by the Police	Registered charities are able to apply for Voluntary Sector Worker Permits for use by volunteers delivering services to residents in the area where the charges operate. These permits are issued free of charge. If charges are introduced then all those who visit the town and benefit from its amenities should contribute to the cost of operating the parking scheme. The Borough Council charges tourists for parking in their off street car parks. The Police have clearly stated that they do not want to be responsible for the routine enforcement of parking regulations.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.
Cllr Steve Wallis, Eastbourne Borough Council (L77)	Opposed to the scheme. What alternatives have been evaluated to improve traffic flow? What are the maintenance charges for the pay and display machines? Why can't the police deal with illegally parked cars? Will the scheme displace parked vehicles further out and lead to an expansion of the area subject to control? How long will the price of the permits be fixed for? Will permits guarantee residents a space near to where they live?	The parking scheme forms part of an integrated package of measures designed to reduce congestion and encourage greater use of alternative forms of transport. Without the control parking in the town centre other measures such as park and ride would not work. The maintenance charges are included in the contractor's management fee. This information is confidential. The police have the powers but not a duty to deal with illegal parking. The Police have stated that they do not want to be involved in the routine enforcement of parking restrictions so they can concentrate their limited resources on higher priorities. The impact of the existing scheme would be assessed before any decision is made as to whether the controls should be extended further out. The pay and display and permit charges would be fixed for the first year of operation of the scheme. The charging structure would be reviewed in the light of the overall financial performance of the scheme. The County Council has never stated that a permit guarantees a space. The introduction of the controls with improved enforcement would make it easier for residents to find a parking space close to where they live.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of comments and issues raised</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
East Sussex and Weald Primary Care Trust (L76) & (E113)	Agree with the broad principles of parking control but concerns about impact on service delivery. Scheme may have an impact on levels of deprivation. Public transport improvements needed for those who find it too difficult to park. Cost of healthcare permits would impact on resources available to provide care services. No provision for dropping off patients outside surgeries. PCT will not be able to validate permit applications	One of the objectives of the parking scheme is to make it easier to access the town centre by buses. This should help those on lower incomes who are unable to afford to run a private car. The cost of residents permit has been kept relatively low (£25). This compared very favourably with the permit charges in other towns and cities across the Country. The Health and Care Worker Permit would provide a concession on the cost of on street parking. The charges for the health and care worker permits (50 pence per permit per day) are necessary to cover the cost of producing the permits and administering the scheme which would make it easier for these workers to park close to their destination. This should help to improve the efficiency of service delivery. Vehicles are able to stop on either single or double yellow lines for the purposes of picking up and setting down passengers. As with the health and care worker permits provided for use in Lewes the PCT would purchase the permits in bulk for distribution to their or distribution to their staff and would not be required to validate each permit.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.
Campaign for Better Transport (E97)	Scheme should be extended to include further roads around the town centre. Explicit objective of scheme and its successors should include specific mention of policies to rebalance transport away from private motorised modes.	No decision about possible extension of the scheme would be made until there has been time to evaluate the impact of the operation of the existing proposals. One of the objectives of the County Councils Second Local Transport Plan covering the period 2006-11 is to manage demand and reduce the need to travel by private car.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of comments and issues raised</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Federation of Small Businesses (E91)	Pleased that business have been involved in the process of developing the parking controls. Concerned about permits for business outside the proposed charging area and condition of multi storey car parks. Parking provision must be made for the needs of employees and business owners. Support the introduction of park and ride.	Trader's day permits would be provided as part of the scheme to meet the needs of business from outside the area who need to visit premises inside the charge area. These would be £2 per day and would be available in advance from the Parking Information Centre. The County Council in partnership with business organisations is in discussions with the private off-street car par operators in the town concerning the quality of their car parks so that they are more attractive to employees and business owners. The County Council, in partnership with the Borough Council, is continuing to look into the possibility of providing a park and ride service for the town.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.
Central Methodist Church (E37)	Accepts need for parking controls. Illegal and obstructive parking has a negative impact on church activities. Do not support parking charges on the seafront. Concerned about impact of charges for health and care worker permits on service delivery.	Eastbourne attracts a large number of visitors who enjoy the seafront and other amenities in the town. If parking charges are introduced charges, it is only fair that they contribute towards the cost of the operation of the parking scheme. The Health and Care Worker Permit would provide a concession on the cost of on street parking. The charges for the health and care worker permits (50 pence per permit per day) are necessary to cover the cost of producing the permits and administering the scheme which would make it easier for these workers to park close to their destination. This should help to improve the efficiency of service delivery.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.
Sussex Police (L75)	No objection or comments to make at this time. Need to discuss detail of arrangements for use of police parking bays outside Eastbourne Police Station in Grove Road.	A meeting will be arranged to discuss detailed operational requirements for use of the Police Bays	To note the comments and respond as indicated.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of comments and issues raised</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Eastbourne Chamber of Commerce, Eastbourne Hospitality Association, Federation of Small Businesses (L135)	Support the enforcement of existing controls but not the need for new controls. If this can not be achieved would support the introduction of new controls as proposed by ESCC. Borough Council's position is supported but Borough must put forward its exact proposals for enforcement before 20 June 2008. If Borough can not satisfy this request then it should withdraw its objection so that decriminalisation [Civil Parking Enforcement] can take place. If the Borough can not provide an alternative the County Council scheme will be supported, subject to the complementary measures being in place before the scheme starts. County Council invited to submit a timed plan to expedite the complementary measures.	The parking scheme is part of an integrated package of measures which will only achieve its objectives if all parts are introduced. More detail about the implementation of complementary measures is set out in Appendix F. Although significant progress has been made on the delivery of these measures there is still more that needs to be done. It can not be the case that the parking scheme should be the last element to be introduced as many of the other measures (e.g. park and ride) would not work unless the parking controls are in place. The existing controls need to be effectively enforced if they are to work properly and give priority to certain users. The Police have stated that they do not want to be involved in routine parking enforced. The Borough Council has been unable to identify and alternative enforcement strategy which would provide the level of enforcement sufficient to ensure that the parking controls work effectively.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of comments and issues raised</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Eastbourne Buses (L134)	Support the introduction of the controls. Proposed charges in the central area are too low. Welcome the additional coach parking bays in Devonshire Place. Would like to see controlled area extended eastwards to Cambridge Road to tackle parking problem in Leaf Hall Area	The proposed charges in the central area of the CPZ were subject to consultation in February 2006 and December 2006 and were reduced in response to comments received during the consultation exercises. The proposed charges in the central area of the CPZ would be the same as the charges that currently operate in Hyde Gardens. They have been set at a reasonable level to achieve a balance between supply and demand and to ensure that there is sufficient revenue to pay for the costs of enforcing the on-street parking regulations. The consultation undertaken in February 2006 indicated support for the introduction of parking controls in a number of streets outside the CPZ (the CPZ extension area). This extension area would extend eastwards to Bourne Street but there was not support for controls in the area beyond that. An assessment would be undertaken of the impact of the possible introduction of revised controls in the existing CPZ before any decision is made whether to extend the controls.	To note the comments and respond as indicated.

## Analysis of comments received in response to preliminary consultation by letter and e-mail

Issue	Consideration	Recommendation
<p>Do not support the proposals (134 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L5 L6 L7 L8 L9 L10 L11 L12 L13 L14 L16 L17 L19 L20 L22 L25 L28 L31 L33 L34 L39 L41 L43 L44 L45 L48 L49 L51 L52 L53 L55 L57 L60 L61 L62 L64 L65 L67 L68 L69 L70 L71 L72 L73 L78 L80 L81 L82 L84 L85 L85A L86 L87 L88 L89 L90 L91 L92 L93 L94 L97 L98 L99 L100 L101 L103 L104 L105 L106 L107 L112 L113 L114 L115 L116 L117 L118 L119 L120 L123 L124 L125 L128 L130 E2 E4 E5 E7 E9 E11 E12 E15 E20 E21 E23 E26 E28 E31 E35 E36 E38 E42 E44 E50 E51 E53 E54 E55 E56 E63 E67 E68 E69 E71 E74 E75 E76 E77 E78 E81 E82 E83 E85 E87 E90 E93 E96 E103 E104 E109 E110 E115 E116 E123</p>	<p>Currently there are high levels of illegal parking in the town making it difficult for residents and those visiting shops and businesses to find a convenient place to park. This illegal parking activity causes congestion and presents a safety hazard. Residents find it difficult to park close to their homes. Action needs to be taken to address these problems. The parking charges are necessary to pay for a level of enforcement which is sufficient to ensure that the controls operate effectively. Income from parking fines alone would not be sufficient to fund the cost of enforcement. The parking scheme was subject to full public consultation in February 2006. The results of this consultation were reported to the County Council's Cabinet in July 2006 at which a decision was made to proceed with the possible introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement and the extension of on-street parking controls. The impact of the scheme would be monitored and modifications would be made as appropriate.</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>Want improved enforcement (34 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L17 L20 L27 L43 L44 L53 L59 L62 L64 L71 L74 L93 L94 L98 L101 L102 L104 E4 E6 E7 E11 E21 E22 E36 E49 E51 E67 E71 E74 E75 E81 E85 E88 E90</p>	<p>Many of the respondents who stated that they were opposed to the proposals also stated that they were in favour of improved enforcement. The Police have stated that they do not want to be responsible for undertaking routine parking enforcement. If the Secretary of State grants to necessary powers to enable Civil Parking Enforcement in the Borough this would enable the County Council to ensure that the regulations are effectively enforced. The introduction of parking charges is necessary to fund the cost of enforcement, as income from fines alone would be insufficient.</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>

Issue	Consideration	Recommendation
<p>Concerned that the scheme will discourage visitors/shoppers/tourists/day trippers (32 Respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L7 L16 L20 L33 L46 L49 L50 L65 L68 L69 L78 L82 L85 L85A L92 L102 L104 L107 L114 L118 L128 L129 E2 E7 E32 E56 E76 E87 E89 E95 E96 E103</p>	<p>Currently, the presence of large numbers of illegally parked vehicles, many of which are parked all day in limited waiting bays makes it difficult for shoppers and visitors to find an on-street parking space in the town centre close to where they want to be. The increased turnover of spaces resulting from the introduction of parking charges and more rigorous enforcement would improve the situation by making easier for those visiting the town who wish to park on-street to find a convenient parking space.</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>Concerned about potential impact on businesses/the local economy (25 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L8 L16 L19 L20 L22 L31 L46 L57 L65 L81 L82 L86 L92 L99 L101 L118 L124 L126 L128 E7 E35 E57 E76 E81 E90</p>	<p>Congestion is a major problem on the arterial routes in and out of Eastbourne. If action is not taken to address this issue then Eastbourne would become an unattractive place to visit and do business. Buses get caught in this congestion which is made worse by the presence of illegally parked vehicles. The effective controls of parking is necessary to tackle congestion and assist the movement of buses It would also ensure that on-street space is available for those visiting the businesses in the town centre and for loading and unloading activity to take place. Without the introduction of the new controls and improved enforcement there is danger that congestion will worsen and the town centre will stagnate. Although the new controls would result in increased costs to businesses these should be off set by the benefits that will be achieved from the effective operation of the parking controls</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>Outside area but want controls in their road (19 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L4, L12 L34 L56 L59 L63 L131 E25 E27 E29 E53 E58 E59 E60 E64 E70 E80 E99 E100</p>	<p>The consultation undertaken in February 2006 indicated support for the introduction of parking controls in a number of streets outside the CPZ (the CPZ extension area). An assessment would be undertaken of the impact of the possible introduction of revised controls in the existing CPZ before any decision is made whether to extend the controls into the surrounding area.</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme but to review its impact on the surrounding streets after 6 months.</p>

Issue	Consideration	Recommendation
<p>The Scheme is a money making exercise ( 19 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L7 L16 L19 L31 L46 L51 L85 L85A L94 L117 E2 E6 E15 E28 E35 E67 E68 E76 E102</p>	<p>The parking charges are necessary to fund a level of enforcement which is sufficient enough to ensure the controls operate effectively. Income from parking fines alone would not be sufficient to fund the cost of enforcement. Any surplus generated from the parking scheme can only be used to fund local transport improvements.</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>Against charging on the seafront ( 14 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L26 L40 L44 L45 L50 L102 L104 E12 E16 E23 E56 E68 E115 E116</p>	<p>Following the outcome of the 2006 consultation, the extent of the area that would be covered by pay and display parking on the seafront has been reduced to ensure that it is better related to the overall size of the proposed CPZ. Eastbourne attracts a large number of visitors to the seafront and it is only fair that they contribute towards the cost of the operation of the parking scheme. The introduction of pay and display parking would increase the turnover of spaces and improve the chances of finding a space.</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>Support the introduction of a park and ride scheme(13 Respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L6 L53 L93 L102 E10 E21 E29 E30 E33 E13 E85 E105 E110</p>	<p>The County Councils has undertaken two studies to investigate the feasibility of operating a park and ride service in the town. Whereas the studies indicated that there would be sufficient demand for a service a suitable site for the scheme has yet to be identified. Park and ride will only operate successfully if on street parking in the town centre is controlled.</p>	<p>To continue investigations into the feasibility of park and ride in Partnership with the Borough Council.</p>
<p>There is not a parking problem in the town centre (9 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L9 L19 L46 L70 L71 L72 L94 E56 E75</p>	<p>Currently parking attendants operating in the town centre are only able to issue warning notices to illegally parked vehicles. At present over 4000 warning notices are being issued each month which demonstrates the level of illegal parking in the town centre. Many of these illegally parked vehicles are parked on double yellow lines where they cause obstruction and danger to other road users and pedestrians</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Concerned about impact of new restriction on Blue Badge Holders (10 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent Identifiers: L24 L35 L53 L96 L108 L110 E9 E41 E66 E79</p>	<p>The County Council has tried to take full account of the needs of people with disabilities in planning the new parking controls in the town centre. It is the case that the amount of kerbside that is covered by a loading restriction has been increased. However, this has only occurred in locations where it is considered that any vehicle parking would obstruct traffic flow or cause danger to other road users (e.g. on corners and near junctions). As part of the introduction of the new controls the number of Blue Badge Bays in the town centre has been increased. In addition to this, Blue Badge Holders are able to park without time limit and without charge in any of the pay and display bays or shared use bays in the town centre, including those on Junction Road. Currently one of the main reasons why Blue Badge Holders have to park on double yellow lines in the town centre is because the parking bays are fully occupied by parked vehicles, many of which park illegally all day. The possible extension of the on-street parking charges combined with the increased level of enforcement that we seeking to introduce, would result in more space becoming available in the parking bays. This would increase the parking options available to Blue Badge Holders close to their destination.</p>	<p>To introduce 8 additional Blue Badge Bays on the seafront. To review the provision of Blue Badge Bays as part of a six month review of the scheme.</p>
<p>Proposed charges are too high (8 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L13 L27 L102 E12 E20 E23 E48 E54</p>	<p>On-street charges are necessary to raise the revenue to pay for the cost of enforcement. In determining where this revenue would be derived from a balance has been struck between the level of the on-street charges and the cost of permits. The on-street tariff levels have been reduced from those that were proposed in the February 2006 consultation. Parking for two hours in Hyde Gardens has been reduced from £4 to £3. The charge for parking for up to 15 minutes anywhere in the CPZ would be 20 pence. This provides for those wishing to make short visits to shops and other business premises.</p>	<p>To not make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Impact on low paid workers/shift workers/pensioners/commuters/staff retention (15 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L17 L25 L55 L97 L114 L129 E38 E90 E117 L57 L97 L108 L126 E54 E117</p>	<p>If the scheme is introduced there would be a number of choices for those who work in the town centre. They would either be able to continue to park on-street outside the town centre Controlled Parking Zone; consider car sharing with a colleague or they could use an alternative form of transport to get into the town centre. The County Council is in the introducing bus priority measures to improve the quality of the bus service and the introduction of a park and ride service is still being investigated.</p>	<p>To continue to progress with the introduction of complementary measures.</p>
<p>Need Integrated Transport Strategy/ complementary measures (9 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L98 L104 L129 E85 E102 E105 E107 E110 E111</p>	<p>The parking scheme forms part of an integrated package of measures for the town set out in the County Councils first Local Transport Plan (The Eastbourne Urban Area Local Transport Plan). Each of the measures on their own will not tackle the town's transport problems and the introduction of parking controls and improved enforcement would play vital role in reducing the number of car trip into the town centre and encouraging greater use of alternative forms of transport.</p>	<p>To continue to progress with the introduction of complementary measures.</p>
<p>Need improved bus services (7 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L82 L104 L129 E29 E56 E101 E110</p>	<p>The County Council is currently in the process of introducing a number of Quality Bus Corridors on arterial routes into the town. Bus priority improvements are being introduced on these routes to reduce bus journey times and improve reliability. A Real Time Bus Information system was also introduced in 2007 which provides up to the minute information about bus arrival times on special signs at bus stops. The County Council, in partnership with the Borough Council, is continuing to look into the possibility of providing a park and ride service for the town. Further improvements to the operation of bus services will be pursued through a Quality Bus Partnership.</p>	<p>To continue to progress with the introduction of complementary measures.</p>

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Concerned about displacement into surrounding area ( 6 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L10 L14 L37 L46 E27 E68</p>	<p>The impact of the introduction of the new controls on the streets surrounding the area where charges are introduced would be monitored to see if there has been displacement. A decision would then be made as to whether to introduce parking controls in the area where there was support for their introduction during the 2006 public consultation exercise.</p>	<p>No to make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>Improve Off street car parks/ provide more off street parking (10 Respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L36 L59 L102 E82 E84 E85 E105 L108 E30 E110</p>	<p>There is already a lot of spare capacity in town centre car parks. This is partly because the condition of many car parks leaves much to be desired. However, these are privately owned commercial operations and the authorities have little power to force improvement: operators will only invest in improving their car parks if their investment is likely to bring a commercial return. The County Council in partnership with the business community is in the process of talking to the private operators to improve the quality of their car parks.</p>	<p>To continue to progress with the introduction of complementary measures including working with private off street car park operators to improve the condition of their car parks.</p>
<p>Want Police Traffic wardens or PCSOs to enforce restrictions (5 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L71 L94 L113 E23 E54</p>	<p>The Police have stated that they do not wish to be involved in routine parking enforcement as they need to concentrate their limited resources on higher priority issues.</p>	<p>Not to make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>The consultation area should be wider/The whole town should be consulted (4 respondents).</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L17 E13 E72 E84</p>	<p>The consultation has not been limited to those in the affected area. Anybody has been able to comment on the proposals. The Council has taken reasonable steps to inform those in properties directly affected about the proposals. Just because someone has not received a circular letter does not mean that they haven't been consulted. The consultation material was available on the County Council's website and the freepost address for response was published in the press. As a result many people from outside the area have responded to the consultation.</p>	<p>Not to make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Object to contractor enforcing regulations (3 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L107 L111 E23</p>	<p>The County Council aims to adhere to the principles of best value and believes that this can be best delivered through the use of a specialist contractor to enforce the parking regulations. The County Council aims to work in partnership with any contractor to ensure that the regulations are enforced fairly and sensitively. The parking attendants will not be paid bonuses related to the number of tickets they issue.</p>	<p>Not to make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>Disagrees with sub-zones for residents permits/sub zones are too small (4 respondents)</p> <p>Respondent identifiers L67 E10 E30 E43</p>	<p>The rationale for the introduction of the sub zones for resident's permits is to provide the mechanism for controlling the balance between the supply and demand for parking space in a particular area of the CPZ. The rationale for the introduction of resident's permits is to enable residents to park in close proximity to their homes. Without sub zoning the danger is that those people who live in streets close to the town centre or the railway station may find it difficult to park close because some of the available space is taken up by resident permit holders who do not live in those roads but who are visiting the attractions nearby. This is why the Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone has been divided into three sub zones.</p>	<p>Not to make any changes to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>Pay and display machine outside Sovereign House, Grand Parade should be moved</p> <p>Respondent Identifiers: L18 L23 L38 L66 L95 E39 E46</p>	<p>The Pay and display machine at this location is in the process of being moved.</p>	<p>To move the pay and display machine outside Sovereign House, Grand Parade.</p>
<p>Comment on proposals for South Cliff</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L11 E53 E58 E59 E60 E64 E70 E80 E89 E99 E100 E122 L137</p>	<p>The results of the localised consultation on proposals to introduce restriction in South Cliff are set out in Appendix E.</p>	
<p>Comment on proposals for Marine Parade</p>	<p>The results of the localised consultation on proposals to modify the restrictions in Marine Parade are set out in Appendix E.</p>	

Issue	Consideration	Recommendation
Respondent identifiers: L42 E92		
<p>Comment on Grove Road Proposals</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L73 E86</p>	The results of the localised consultation on proposals to modify the restrictions in Grove Road are set out in Appendix E.	
<p>Four hour maximum stay limit in Wilmington Square, Lascelles Terrace, Howard Square</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L1 L121</p>	The results of the localised consultation on proposals to modify the maximum time limit in these roads is set out in Appendix E.	
<p>Parking Bay locations are hazardous/cause congestion on Grove road, top end of South Street, Connaught Road, Lismore Road and Trinity Place</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: E105 E118</p>	A safety audit has been undertaken on the layout of the parking controls which did not identify any issues at these locations	Not to make any changes to the proposed scheme.
<p>Additional Doctor's Bay in Lushington Road</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L30</p>	There are currently two doctor's bays in Lushington road. This response made a request for a third in view of the fact that the Practice had expanded. The introduction of a third Doctors bay would mean that the adjacent shared use bay would have to be shortened by 6 metres.	The introduction of a third Doctors Bay to be included in the draft Traffic Orders for Lushington Road for consultation.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Some Shared Use parking required on King Edwards Parade in the vicinity of Grand Court for residents.</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: E43</p>	<p>Request for the parking space to be provided on King Edward's Parade that would allow residents living in Grand Court to park. Currently all of the parking on King Edwards Parade is pay and display only.</p>	<p>The parking bay outside Grand Court on King Edward's Parade be converted into a shared use bay allowing both permit holders to park and pay and display.</p>
<p>Access to Lavatories on seafront by Blue Badge Holders</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: E61</p>	<p>Problems for Blue Badge Holders wanting to access the public lavatories on the seafront.</p>	<p>Eight additional Blue Badge Bays to be provided at along the seafront close to lavatories</p>
<p>Not enough Parking for residents of Grand Parade (near the pier), Queens Gardens, Elms Avenue and Cavendish Place</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: E88</p>	<p>The introduction of parking charges and improved enforcement would displace those who currently park all day in these bays and increase the turnover of vehicles. This should make more space available for residents in these bays. The need for any further modifications would be considered following a review of the operational performance of the scheme after it has been in operation for six months.</p>	<p>Not to make any changes to the proposed scheme but to consider the need for further modifications following a review of the scheme after it has been in operation for six months.</p>
<p>Problem with Restrictions in Lion Lane. Should be double yellow line on both sides without a lading restrictions</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: E103</p>	<p>Detailed comments have been reviewed and assessed. Restrictions would be modified to introduce double yellow line on both sides of Lion Lane and loading restriction would be removed.</p>	<p>Modify restrictions in accordance with comments received.</p>

Issue	Consideration	Recommendation
<p>Wants resident permit only bays in Calverley Road</p> <p>Respondent identifiers: L111</p>	<p>The bays in Calverley Road are currently permit holder only bays and the introduction of improved enforcement would displace those vehicles that currently park in these bays without a permit. This should free up more space for resident's vehicles. The need for any further modifications would be considered following a review of the operational performance of the scheme after it has been in operation for six months.</p>	<p>Not to make any changes to the proposed scheme but to consider the need for further modifications following a review of the scheme after it has been in operation for six months.</p>
<p>Problem of coaches parking illegally. More loading space required in Carlisle Road for residents.</p> <p>Respondent identifier: L138</p>	<p>The ability to undertake enforcement action against all illegally parked vehicles, including coaches, would be dependent upon whether the County Councils application for Civil Parking Enforcement powers is approved. Enforcement action would be taken against illegally parked vehicles if the new controls are introduced. The introduction of an additional loading bay in Carlisle road would be available to goods vehicles only. More space should be available in the shared use bays for residents in Carlisle Road if the parking charges are introduced as this would increase the turnover of vehicles. The need for any further modifications would be considered following a review of the operational performance of the scheme after it has been in operation for six months.</p>	<p>Not to make any changes to the proposed scheme but to consider the need for further modifications following a review of the scheme after it has been in operation for six months.</p>

## Results of consultation on localised changes to the layout of the controls

### 1. Introduction

This appendix sets out the results of the ten localised consultations exercises concerning possible changes to the layout of the parking locations in certain roads in the town centre. These changes were proposed mainly in response to representations that had been received from members of the public following revision to the layout of the new controls which were introduced in October last year.

The streets in which modifications were being proposed were West Terrace, South Cliff, Marine Road, Royal Parade, Cornfield Road, Hyde Gardens, Devonshire Place and a number of the roads south of Compton Street between Devonshire Place and Wilmington Square.

Each property in the area surrounding the proposed modification was sent a consultation letter ( in addition to the general letter seeking comments on the scheme as a whole) setting out the details of the proposed change, a colour map showing its location and a response form and a freepost envelop in which to return it. The letter requested that the respondent indicate whether or not they supported the proposed change on the response form. There was space on the form for additional comments. A total of 664 consultation letters were sent out.

An analysis of the responses from each of the localised consultations is set out below along with recommendations about whether or not the posed changes should be implemented.

### 2. Introduction of two coach bays in the southern section of Devonshire Place.

2.1 The specific change that was consulted on would involve the introduction of two coach bays in the section of Devonshire Place between Compton Street and Grand Parade. The proposals were developed in response to representations from local Hoteliers requesting more coach parking for their guests. The coach bays would replace the two sections of double yellow line, which exist in between the shared use bays. Coached would be permitted to wait in the bays for up to 30 minutes which is sufficient time to allow passengers and their luggage to be loaded and unloaded. The coach bays would not be occupied buy coaches parking all day. The introduction of the coach bays would mean that the length of two adjacent shared use bays would have to be reduced by approximately one car length each. However, this should not increase the parking pressure in Devonshire Place as the majority of the rest of the kerbside and central area is shared use parking.

2.2 A total of five consultation letters were sent to the properties in the southern section of Devonshire Place and the two hotels on the seafront either side of its junction with Grand Parade. Five responses were returned, four of which supported the modification and one which did not. It was one of the hotels adjacent to one of the potential coach bays that did not support the proposal. The reason given was that the proposed coach bay on the western side of the road would obstruct access to the hotel delivery entrance when it was occupied and that there was alternative coach parking on the seafront. However, vehicles would still be permitted to load and unload from the coach bays or the adjacent shared use bays. A decision not to provide the coach bay would leave another hotel further along Devonshire Place without any coach parking.

**Recommendation: To approve the introduction of the two additional coach bays on Devonshire Place and to request that the impact of the introduction of the coach bays be monitored and reviewed after they have been in operation for six months.**

### 3. Gildredge Road

3.1 The specific changes that were subject to consultation in Gildredge Road would involve the introduction of a new 17 metre long goods vehicle loading only bay outside numbers 5 to 9 Gildredge Road. The reason for this proposal is to enable collections and deliveries to and from the businesses in the immediate area. The introduction of the loading bay would mean that the length of the existing limited waiting bay would have to be reduced. This bay will still be long enough to accommodate two cars and alternative short term space would be available in the shared use bays in Hyde Gardens and Ivy Terrace.

3.2 A total of 41 consultation letters were despatched to the residential and business addresses in the northern section of Gildredge Road. A total of 15 responses were received, six of whom supported the proposals, eight of whom did not and one who stated that they didn't know/ had no opinion. The main issue raised by those who did not support the proposals was that they would result in a loss of pay and display parking space.

**Recommendation: Not to approve the introduction of any modification to the layout of the parking controls in the northern section of Gildredge Road.**

### 4. Grove Road

4.1 There are three changes to the layout of the parking controls in Grove Road that were consulted on. The first involves the removal of the limited waiting bay outside numbers 16 to 32 Grove Road and its replacement with double yellow lines. This change was proposed because, when a goods vehicle uses the loading bay outside the Spar store on the opposite side of the road, it narrows the road to the extent that other large vehicles are unable to pass. Grove Road is a key traffic route to the west of the town centre and it is vital that the free flow of traffic is maintained at all times. The loading bay outside number 16 to 20 Grove Road would be retained as the road is wide enough at this point to accommodate parking on both sides.

4.2 A total of 136 consultation letters were despatched to addresses in Grove Road. A total of 42 responses were received, 18 of whom supported the proposals 16 of whom did not with eight stating that they did not know/had no opinion. The main issue raised by those who did not support the proposals was the loss of pay and display parking space. Although a majority of respondents were in favour of this proposal, the results were finally balanced. The traffic management and safety implications of not removing this bay have to be set against the negative impacts of removing pay and display parking space. There are other opportunities for people to park along Grove Road.

**Recommendation: To approve the removal of the limited waiting bay outside Nos. 16 to 32 Grove Road and its replacement with Double yellow lines.**

4.3 The second change is to introduce a new Blue Badge Bay on the adjacent to the existing loading outside 16-20 Grove Road. Of the 42 respondents who replied to the consultation, 15 stated that they supported the introduction of the Blue Badge parking bay and 15 said that they did not, with 12 stating that they did not know/had no opinion. This who did not support the introduction of the bay wished to see the pay and display parking retained. There are a number of key services in this section of Grove Road including the library and the Borough Council Offices. Although there is already one disabled bay outside the Library, this may be insufficient to meet demand.

**Recommendation: To approve the introduction of an additional Blue Badge Bay outside 16-20 Grove Road.**

4.4 The third change in Grove Road that was consulted on was the possible introduction of a new goods vehicle loading bay outside Numbers 45 to 47. This change is being proposed in response to requests from traders in the area to facilitate collection and deliveries from their premises. Currently the loading and unloading of vehicles takes place from the double yellow line across the road. However the presence of a delivery vehicle on one side and parked vehicles in the shared use bays on the other can traffic flow particularly for larger vehicles using Grove Road. For this reason a no loading restriction has been introduced on the double yellow line restriction. The provision of a loading bay would allow deliveries to take place without obstructing traffic flow.

4.5 A total of 20 respondents indicated that they supported the change, 20 stating that they did not with 2 stating that they did not know/had no opinion. Those who were opposed to the proposal objected to the loss of parking space. This proposal also generated additional comments and correspondence from traders who stated that they wished to see the arrangement where vehicles could load and load from the double yellow line on the opposite side of the road reinstated. However, they also stated that if the loading bay was introduced it would be preferable to create one 20 metre long loading bay outside numbers 45 to 49 as a 10 metre long bay may not be long enough to accommodate all of their delivery vehicles. They also suggested that the existing loading bay further along the road outside Nos. 53 to 55 could be removed so that there was no further loss of parking space for other users as a result of the creation of the 20 metre long loading bay.

4.6 Although the results of the consultation show a balance in the number of respondents for and against the proposal put out for consultation, the additional comments that have been received have identified a modified proposal which would potentially work better for the traders.

**Recommendation: To approve the introduction of a 20 metre long loading bay outside Nos. 45 to 49 Grove Road with the removal of the existing loading bay outside Nos. 53 to 55 to ensure no net loss of parking space.**

## **5. Hyde Gardens**

5.1 There were two changes to the layout of the on street parking controls in Hyde Gardens that were consulted on. The first involved the extension of the existing taxi bay at the eastern end of Hyde Gardens by 6 metres. This would mean that the taxi bay would be able to accommodate three taxis. The proposal followed requests from taxi operators for increased provision of taxi rank space in close proximity to the main shopping area in the town. The length of the adjacent shared use bay would have to be reduced by one car length to accommodate this modification.

5.2 The second modification would involve the conversion of the shared use bay on the southern side of Hyde Gardens into a Blue Badge Holder bay. This would increase the provision of dedicated spaces for people with disabilities in close proximity to the main shopping and commercial streets in the town centre.

5.3 The introduction of both modifications would result in a loss of three shared use parking spaces, which are currently available to permit holders and people wishing to pay and display. However, this should not result in a significant increase in parking pressure in the area, as there are considerable lengths of shared use parking along the remainder of Hyde Gardens.

5.4 A total of 49 consultation letters were sent out to premises in the area of Hyde Gardens immediately adjacent to the proposed modifications. Only three responses were received, two of which indicated support for the proposals with one opposed. The level of response received is disappointing and can be taken as an indication that the proposed

changes would not have a significant impact on the people living and working in this area of Hyde Gardens.

**Recommendation: To approve the extension of the existing taxi bay at the eastern end of Hyde Gardens by 6 metres and the conversion of the shared use bay on the southern side of Hyde Gardens into a Blue Badge Holder bay.**

## **6. Langney Road**

6.1 The specific proposal that was consulted on would involve the introduction of an additional two space taxi bay outside Numbers 1 to 3 Langney Road. The location of the proposed taxi bay is shown on the attached map. The proposal follows requests from the taxi operators for increased provision of taxi rank space in close proximity to the main shopping area in the town. The introduction of the taxi rank would mean that the existing 70 metre long limited waiting bay would have to be reduced in length by 10 metres (approximately two car lengths). This should not significantly increase the parking pressure in the area as there are short term parking bays on both sides of this section of Langney Road.

6.2 A total of 47 consultation letters were sent out to properties in both Langney Road and Terminus Road. A total of 7 responses were received four of whom supported the proposals and three of whom did not. Those who were opposed to the proposals felt that there was already enough taxi provision that the conversion of the bays would increase traffic congestion and that the rank should be relocated elsewhere. This modification would provide additional taxi bays in close proximity to the main shopping streets. It would be created by converting existing permitted parking bays and therefore would not increase congestion. It is considered the most suitable location for the additional taxi space to be provided.

**Recommendation: To approve the introduction of a taxi bay outside 1 to 3 Langney Road providing space for two taxis.**

## **7. Marine Parade**

7.1 There were two changes that were consulted on relating to a specific section of Marine Parade and Royal Parade. The first change involved bringing the section of Marine Parade between its junctions with Royal Parade and Marine Road into the Controlled Parking Zone. This section of Marine Parade is heavily parked and the presence of parked cars on both sides of the road obstructs traffic flow and causes a potential safety hazard. Hoteliers in this section of the road have complained about the fact that they would be unable to obtain hotel guest permits because they are currently outside the CPZ. A shared use bay would be introduced on one side of the road with double yellow line on the other to ensure the free flow of traffic and prevent obstructions around the junctions. Those living along this section of Marine Parade would be eligible for residents' permits that would enable them to park in the shared use bay. The shared use bay would also be available for those wishing to park for up to two hours.

7.2 A total of 55 consultation letters were sent out to properties in both Marine Parade and Royal Parade. A total of 24 responses were received. A total of 8 respondents said that they supported the introduction of controls in Marine Parade, whereas 14 said they didn't and two said they didn't know/had no opinion. A clear majority of respondents were against the proposals.

**Recommendation: Not to approve the introduction of parking controls into Marine Parade at this time.**

7.3 The second change that was subject to consultation involved the conversion on one

limited waiting bays in Royal Parade into a goods vehicle loading bay. This would enable collections and deliveries to and from the businesses in the area, primarily in the section of Marine Parade referred to above.

7.4 A total of 4 respondents said that they supported this modification Marine Parade, whereas 16 said they didn't and four said they didn't know/had no opinion. A clear majority of respondents were against the proposal.

**Recommendation: Not to approve the conversion of the permitted parking bay on Royal Parade into a loading bay.**

## **8. South Cliff**

8.1 The specific change that was subject to consultation involves the introduction parking controls along the entire length of South Cliff, which currently lies just outside the Controlled Parking Zone. Since the introduction of the new controls in October 2007, residents in South Cliff have written in and submitted customer comment forms in the Parking Information Centre complaining that they find it difficult to park near their homes. Under the proposals, a permit holder only bay would be introduced outside numbers 1 to 11 South Cliff. Residents living in South Cliff would then be eligible for a residents' permit that would allow them to park in this bay. Sections of pay and display parking would be introduced along the remainder of South Cliff with double yellow lines opposite each of the bays to prevent obstruction and enable the free flow of traffic.

8.2 A total of 31 consultation letters were sent to addresses in South Cliff. A total of 27 responses were received from properties in South Cliff. A total of 16 respondents stated that they supported the proposals with 10 stating that they did not and one giving a 'don't know/no opinion' response. In opposing the introduction of the proposed change respondents indicated that they objected to paying for parking permits and wanted the road left as it is with cars parked on both sides of the road. A number of those who supported the proposal also said that they felt that the amount of permit holder parking would be insufficient to cater for the demand of those living in South Cliff. To provide more space for residents it is proposed to make the remainder of the parking on South Cliff shared use, which would allow both resident permit holders and those wishing to pay and display to park.

8.3 The consultation on the proposed changes in South Cliff generated a number of letters, email and telephone calls from residents living in Silverdale Road, South Cliff Avenue and St John's Road concerned about the potential displacement of parked vehicles into their roads if the new controls came into effect. Many of the letters and e-mail demanded that the controls be extended into their roads with the provision of free permits for residents. In the public consultation exercise undertaken in 2006 a majority of respondents in these roads indicated that they did not wish to have parking controls in their roads. Until the launch of the preliminary consultation was there have not been any requests for controls to be introduced in sections of these roads. Any proposals to introduce controls in these roads would have to be undertaken on an area wide basis. On 8 February 2008 The Lead Member for Transport and Environment agreed that any decision on future extensions of the parking controls would only be made once there had been an opportunity to assess the impact of the existing controls on surrounding streets. It is not proposed to take forward this request for additional controls in the roads adjacent to South Cliff at this time.

### **Recommendations:**

- **To approve the introduction of parking controls in South Cliff which would consist of the introduction of permit holder only bays outside Nos. 1 to 11 South Cliff with the remainder of the parking bays in South Cliff being shared use for permit holders and those wishing to pay and display.**

- To note the request from a number of residents in the sections of South Cliff Avenue, Silverdale Road and St John's Road closest to the seafront for the introduction of parking controls in their roads.

## 9. Burlington Place (part only), Howard Square, Lascelles Terrace, and Wilmington Square

9.1 The change that was subject to consultation would involve increasing the maximum period of stay permitted in the shared use bays in a number of roads south of Compton Street to be increased from two hours to four hours. The County Council has received representations from visitors in the town and the theatres in the area, wishing to see the maximum period of stay extended. Under the proposals, a four hour maximum stay would be introduced in the shared use bays in Burlington Place (between Compton Street and Grand Parade), Howard Square, Lascelles Terrace and Wilmington Square. The existing two hour limit in Carlisle Road would be retained to ensure sufficient turnover of spaces serving the commercial premises in this road.

9.2 A total of 183 consultation letters were sent out and a total of 52 responses were received from across the area. A total of 33 respondents stated that they supported the proposed modification with 18 stating that they did not and one giving a 'don't know /no opinion' response. Among the comments made by those who did not support the proposal were that they were opposed to pay to park, would like resident only bays and would like the two hour limit retained.

**Recommendation: To approve the introduction of a four hour maximum stay limit in the shared use bays in Burlington Place (between Compton Street and Grand Parade), Howard Square, Lascelles Terrace and Wilmington Square.**

## 10. South Street

10.1 The specific proposal that was subject to consultation would involve a reduction in the length of the shared use bay outside Number 19 South Street by 5 metres (one car length). This change has been requested by one of the businesses (a funeral directors) on South Street to ensure that they can load and unload to and from their adjacent premises. Although the proposed reduction in the length of the shared use bay would result in the loss of one parking space, there are other shared use bays in close proximity along both sides of South Street.

10.2 A total of 75 consultation letters were sent out to addresses in South Street with a total of 14 responses being received. A total of seven respondents stated that they supported the introduction of the proposed modification and seven stated that they did not. Those who did not support the proposed modification were concerned about the loss of parking space. Although the consultation results are balanced this modification was requested by a firm of funeral directors to enable them to ensure that they are able to load and unload from their premises at all times.

**Recommendation: To approve the reduction of the length of the shared use bay outside Number 19 South Street by 5 metres.**

## 11. West Terrace

11.1 The specific change that was subject to consultation in West Terrace would involve the conversion of the existing permit holder only bays into resident permit holder only bays. Following the introduction of the new controls in October 2007, a number of representations have been received from residents who live in West Terrace requesting this modification.

This is due to the difficulties they have in finding a parking space in West Terrace. If this change was introduced, it would mean that business permit holders would no longer be able to park in West Terrace. However, business permit holders would still be able to park in the shared use bays in Hyde Gardens and Ivy Terrace.

11.2 A total of 42 consultation letters were sent to addresses in West Terrace. A total of 23 replies were received with 20 respondents being in support of the proposed modification, two against and one having no opinion.

**Recommendation: To approve the introduction of resident permit holder only parking in West Terrace.**

*This page is left blank*

## Eastbourne Parking Scheme – Complementary Measures

1.1 The Eastbourne parking scheme is part of an integrated package of measures for the town that was set out in our first Local Transport Plan (LTP) over seven years ago and is built upon in the current LTP which covers the period 2006 to 2011. The package is an indivisible whole and each element of the package both contributes to and depends upon each of the other elements.

1.2 Since the plan was published, progress has already been made on a number of fronts. Massive investment has been made in building Jubilee Way and other new roads which have transformed access to the eastern parts of Eastbourne and relieved a number of other roads. Highway improvements in Seaside Road and Terminus Road have brought environmental benefits and contributed to regeneration, while improvements elsewhere have assisted traffic flow and improved road safety.

1.3 Almost £1 million has already been invested in a real time bus information system: passenger information is available at main bus stops, many buses are already equipped and operators are able to manage their fleets more effectively.

1.4 A Quality Bus Partnership has been established to improve all aspects of bus travel. Bus operators are improving the quality of buses and staff training. The business community has committed to working with bus operators to develop fares initiatives. Plans are well advanced for bus priority measures on Seaside which would allow buses to operate with fewer delays and more reliably and for a “bus gate” at Sovereign Harbour which will allow buses to operate through services. Similar measures are being planned on other main corridors.

1.5 Although good progress has been made towards improving bus services, buses are often delayed and services made unreliable by illegal parking and the associated congestion. Bus operators say that the one thing that would improve services most would be the effective control of parking.

1.6 Many people advocate Park & Ride as the answer to Eastbourne’s parking problems. Park & Ride may, indeed, have a role to play and the County Council has already done work with business organisation to explore its potential. The Borough Council has set aside £25,000 for a further study of Park & Ride and commercial opportunities are also being explored. However, Park & Ride will only ever be **part** of the solution and, without effective parking controls in the town centre, it will never be viable: given the choice, most people would continue to park free of charge, where they want on the street in the town centre.

1.7 Some people say that the answer is for more people to use car parks rather than to park on the streets. There is, indeed, a lot of spare capacity in town centre car parks but people choose not to park in them. This is partly because the condition of many car parks leaves much to be desired. However, these are privately owned commercial operations and the authorities have little power to force improvement: operators will only invest in improving their car parks if their investment is likely to bring a commercial return.

1.8 But the condition of the car parks is only **part** of the problem. Without effective control of parking on the street, many people would continue to opt to park free of charge on the street, close to their destination, rather than pay to park in a multi storey car park, even if conditions are improved.

1.9 With effective parking controls and charges on the street now an imminent prospect, the County Council and the business community are about to launch an initiative to

encourage car park operators to raise their standards. Those that do will have the prospect of achieving commercial returns on their investment.

1.10 To delay implementing the parking improvements, as some have argued, until all other elements of the package have been fully implemented is illogical. It would unnecessarily perpetuate current problems. It would deny to residents, hotel guests, businesses, tradespeople and others the benefits that more sophisticated parking controls offer. Crucially, many of the other elements of the transport package cannot be achieved, or cannot be achieved fully, without the parking controls and enforcement being in place. And that cannot happen without charging.

1.11 The sensible approach is to continue to move forward on a number of fronts with the parking improvements the immediate priority.

## Legal Considerations.

### 1. Introduction

1.1 This appendix sets out the legal considerations relating to the decision about whether to promote the introduction of traffic orders. In making this decision the County Council must have regard to the requirements of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and any orders would have to be made in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. A decision about whether to introduce parking controls must be made on traffic, transport, environment and amenity grounds.

### 2. Consideration of powers

2.1 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (the Act) contains provisions that allows the County Council as a Traffic Authority to make traffic orders for certain purposes set out in the Act. When exercising its powers under the Act, the County Council is under a duty imposed by section 122 to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. When deciding to exercise its powers the Council must, so far as practicable, have regard to a number of matters set out in Section 122(2), which are as follows:

- The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- The effect on the amenities of any locality affected, including the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles so as to preserve or to improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run.
- The National Air Quality strategy prepared under Section 80 of the Environmental Act 1995.
- The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or wishing to use such vehicles.
- Any other matter appearing to the Local Authority to be relevant.

#### **The general duty under Section 122 of the Act**

2.2 Currently many residents living in the town centre find it difficult to park close to their homes and the lack of available on-street parking space means the efficiency of businesses is reduced. Loading and unloading is often difficult, Blue Badge holders and those needing to make short visits to local businesses find it difficult to park close to where they want to be.

2.3 The presence of illegally parked vehicles contributes to congestion and gives rise to safety hazards. The implications of illegally parked vehicles can be particularly serious for disabled people, pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users. In the longer term these parking problems could constrain the potential for redevelopment in the town centre.

2.4 The new parking controls would seek to address these issues and in exercising these powers the authority would also meet the requirement of the traffic management duty set out in Section 122 of the Act. The proposed Orders would introduce continuous on-street parking control in a defined area of the town centre. The controls would help ensure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) by controlling when and where vehicles can park on-street. The effect of the controls would be to restrict and prohibit parking in locations where it would obstruct traffic flow or cause danger to other road users, including pedestrians (e.g. at junctions). The introduction of these new controls would ensure that the needs of those requiring convenient on-street parking places close to their destination (e.g. residents and Blue Badge Holders) would be

adequately provided for.

## **Specific Considerations under Section 122(2) of the Act**

### Securing access to premises

2.5 The parking controls would ensure reasonable access to premises would be maintained in a number of ways. Yellow lines would be introduced in front of sections of dropped kerb to ensure off street accesses is maintained. Goods vehicle loading bays would be provided to ensure collection and deliveries can take place to commercial premises. Residents would be able to purchase parking permits which would entitle them to park in permitted parking bays close to their homes.

### Impact on amenity

2.6 Amenity is a commonly used word but it is often difficult to define what exactly what it is. "Amenity" has been defined by the courts as "pleasant circumstances or features, advantages" (Re Ellis and Ruislip-Northwood UDC (1920)). The introduction of on-street parking controls can have a detrimental impact on the appearance of an area, as it involves the introduction of additional road markings and signs, which can be visually intrusive. There are already continuous parking controls in operation in Eastbourne town centre and the introduction of the new controls under these orders would not significantly increase the degree of visual intrusion. Careful consideration has been given to the siting of pay and display machines to ensure that they do not obstruct the footway or obstruct people's views. Illegally parked vehicles can detract from the amenity of an area by causing congestion and obstructing the movement of pedestrians.

### Impact on air quality

2.7 Under Part IV of Environment Act 1995 , local authorities are required to review and assess air quality in their areas. The primary objective of this process is to identify areas where air quality is unlikely to meet the objectives prescribed in the Air Quality Regulations 2000 as amended by the Air Quality (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2002 , and the Air Quality Limit Values Regulations 2003 within the relevant periods. Where such areas are identified the local authority is required to designate an Air Quality Management Area and develop an action plan to achieve the required improvements. Currently, there are no locations in Eastbourne where air quality exceeds the national Air Quality objectives.

2.8 The issue of air quality has been taken into account in the development of the County Council's Second Local Transport Plan. Many of the policy interventions aimed at reducing congestion and improving the efficiency of the transport network, including the introduction of revised on street parking controls in Eastbourne town centre, would help improve air quality. The introduction of these controls would reduce the amount of traffic circulating in the town centre and reduce congestion resulting from the presence of illegally parked vehicles.

### Impact on public service vehicles

2.9 The introduction of the revised on-street controls would improve conditions for buses in the town centre by ensuring that parking is restricted or prohibited in locations where it would inhibit the flow of traffic. Buses would also benefit from the reductions in traffic flow that would result from a reduction in a number of vehicles circulating in order to find a parking space.

### Other relevant matters

2.10 Currently, parking on-street in much of the town centre is free whilst drivers pay to park in off-street car parks even outside the town centre. As a result, much of the off-street parking stock in the town is under-utilised and the majority of the streets are heavily parked all day.

2.11 Along with measures to improve public transport, controlled parking and improved enforcement are cornerstones of a package of sustainable transport measures for Eastbourne set out in the Council's Local Transport Plan. The LTP package was established seven years ago, the product of wide consultation and community engagement. It included a detailed strategy for tackling parking problems in the town. The LTP was endorsed by Eastbourne Borough Council in 2000. The second LTP (LTP2) built upon the first plan, is consistent with Central Government policy and was rated by GOSE in December 2006 as "good".

2.12 There are strong linkages between the LTP2 transport policy framework and the East Sussex "Pride of Place" Community Strategy objectives. Specifically, LTP2 contributes to the Council's Local Area Agreement (LAA) High Level Outcomes and the County Council's Policy Steers.

2.13 The introduction of effective area wide on-street parking controls and improved enforcement in Hastings and Lewes has made a major contribution to successful delivery of LTP objectives. In Lewes, for example, traffic growth, as measured by the number of vehicle kilometres, has actually decreased by 4.1% in 2006/07 against the 2003/04 baseline following the adoption of DPE powers and the introduction of parking charges. In Hastings, the effective control of parking has been a major factor in achieving increased bus patronage.

2.14 Without parking controls and enforcement, the Council's ability to deliver a large raft of LTP2 targets would be compromised. Areas and related targets particularly likely to be compromised include:

- managing demand,
- reducing the need to travel by private car,
- reducing congestion,
- improving the efficiency of the transport network, and
- protecting the environment.

2.15 Effective control of parking is a pre-requisite for reliable bus operation which, in turn, is key to attracting more passengers and reducing car dependency, congestion and associated problems. The Council has established a quality bus partnership with the Borough Council, the business community, transport operators and others to oversee a programme of improvements. Through the partnership, the Council has invested over £900,000 in real time bus information and is rolling out a multi-million pound programme of other improvements to bus infrastructure. Without effective parking enforcement, the effectiveness of this investment would be compromised. Without charging in the town centre it is most unlikely that park and ride would attract sufficient passengers to make it viable.

### **3. Application of the powers**

3.1 Should a decision be made to proceed towards implementation of the parking scheme, draft Orders should be advertised, covering yellow lines, loading restrictions and permitted parking. The Orders would be made under Sections 1(1) and (2), 2(1) to (3), 4, 32, 35, 36, 45, 46 and 49 of, the Act.

3.2 The general power to make traffic regulation orders is contained in Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The purposes for which the traffic authority may make an order under Section 1 include:

- for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising;
- for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians);

3.3 A package of restrictions would be introduced which would create on-street parking places and prohibit and restrict waiting and loading. These restrictions would be introduced in accordance with Section 1 of the Act because the Authority considers that it is desirable and reasonable to prevent vehicles stopping in places where it is not safe or practical in order to protect access for emergency vehicles, to allow traffic flow and to improve road safety.

3.4 Section 2 of the Act sets out what a traffic regulation order may provide. These provisions include specifically prohibiting or restricting the waiting of vehicles or the loading and unloading of vehicles, either at all times or during specified periods on all days or certain days. The Orders would create and retain single and double yellow lines to prevent parking and loading and unloading in places where it is not safe or practical in order to protect access for emergency vehicles, to allow traffic flow and to improve road safety.

3.5 Most of the controls would operate between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday (everyday on the seafront) as these are the times at which the demand for parking space is highest and reflect the preferences of consultees in the streets concerned. The restrictions on waiting and loading would either operate during the same periods or all day in locations where it is not safe or practical to allow vehicles to park or, as appropriate, to load and unload.

3.6 Section 32 of the Act contains provisions that enable a local authority to provide parking places on the road (without payment) for the purposes of relieving or preventing traffic congestion. I consider that it is desirable and reasonable to allow on-street parking in locations where this would not restrict traffic flow or cause a safety hazard. The creation of permitted parking places in marked bays would enable the location of parked vehicles to be controlled to ensure that they would not obstruct traffic flow.

3.7 Section 35 of the Act contains provisions that enable restrictions to be placed on the use of permitted parking places. Restrictions would be placed on the use of certain parking places created under Section 32 to residents, businesses, Blue Badge Holders, taxis, doctors, ambulances, police vehicles, solo motorcycles, goods vehicles (for the purposes of loading and unloading) and coaches. I consider that it is desirable and reasonable to give priority access to these groups of users. For example, residents and others visiting residential properties should be able to park as close as possible to their homes to minimise the need for unnecessary circulation of traffic in residential streets. Similarly, it is desirable to allow priority access for Blue Badge Holders to minimise the distance that such users need to travel to their ultimate destination.

3.8 Section 45 of the Act contains provisions that enable local authorities to designate on-street parking places for payment. These charges can be levied either at the time that the vehicle is parked, with the payment enabling the vehicle to be left for a specified period (e.g. pay and display) or by means of a paid parking permit (e.g. a residents parking permit).

3.9 Section 45(3) of the Act sets out the factors the authority should take into account in determining which spaces should be designated as on-street parking places for payment. The authority is required to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining property, the need to maintain the free movement of traffic, the need to maintain reasonable access to premises; to consider what off-street parking is available in

the area and how the provision of paid on-street parking is likely to be encourage greater use of off-street parking.

3.10 Most of these factors have also been taken account in the considering the Authority's duty under section 122 of the Act. The introduction of paid parking permits would assist property owners and occupiers by making it easier to park closer to their premises. There is currently only on-street charging in two roads in the town centre area whereas charges are levied in all of the off-street car parks. The extension of on-street charges across the town centre area would encourage greater use of the off-street car parks. The on-street parking places and prohibition and restriction of waiting order provides for the issuing of permits because it is desirable and reasonable to give priority access to certain parking places to residents, businesses, residents' visitors, hotel guests, voluntary sector workers, doctors, health and care workers and tradespeople. It is also reasonable for the Authority to consider offsetting the cost of enforcing the regulations by charging those using the facilities rather than from other sources.

3.11 Section 46 of the Act places the requirement on the authority to prescribe charges at, and regulation of, designated parking places. In accordance with this requirement, the pay and display tariffs and permit charges would be set out in a schedule to the on-street parking places and prohibition and restriction of waiting order.

*This page is left blank*