



**Bishopston, Cotham and Redland
Neighbourhood Partnership**

Monday 24th June 2013

Report of: Andrew McGrath – Communities & Neighbourhoods

Title: Highways issues *(the NP is asked to note that this report has not been submitted by BCC Highways team)*

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 9036436

The NP is asked:

- To note and discuss that a report will not be coming to this NP from BCC highways regarding Footways Maintenance Schemes, as indicated at the March NP meeting. It is now expected at a later date
- To note and discuss the letter sent to the Mayor following the last NP, and the reply from Peter Mann, Director of Highways, on behalf of the Mayor, regarding Highways devolved traffic schemes
- To note and discuss the various discussions that have recently been held by the NP and with residents, traders and officers, regarding Resident Parking Schemes
- To note the NP's public statement to the Scrutiny meeting held on 20th June (copies to be handed out at the meeting) and discuss and agree the statement it wishes to submit to Cabinet for its meeting on 27th June (provisional)

1.0 At the last NP a report came from Highways, which included the following passage regarding **Footway maintenance schemes**: ‘Work on footways maintenance schemes is delayed until later in the year. An update on this will be provided in June 2013’. This will now happen at a later meeting

Neighbourhood Partnerships will be asked to choose their footway schemes in the September/October meetings this year. The surface dressing work is currently being carried out, and Highways officers are progressing the work to clear the backlog of local traffic schemes.

The Chair of the NP has requested that this be discussed as no report from Highways has been provided for this meeting.

1.1 City wide NP Highways Review Sessions. In June 2012 NPs were invited to take part in a review session with Highways officers about the Highways devolved budgets. An action plan was developed and this was reviewed in November 2012. The intention was to revisit this action plan in June 2013 again. This will now be done as part of the NP review as Highways activities featured repeatedly in the requests for more influence and information, which mirrors some of the actions from the Highways review sessions in 2012. The intention is to start working on this in the autumn and the council is committed to ensuring that there is a role for elected members and NP members in this work.

1.2 At the last NP meeting the Chair of the NP was requested to write to the Mayor outlining the NP’s concerns regarding the non-delivery of the minor traffic schemes in 2013/14. The letter is set out below. The reply, sent by Peter Mann (Director of Highways), is set out below this. The NP may wish to discuss this

Dear Mayor

2.4.13

Our Neighbourhood Partnership (NP) met on Monday 25th March and considered the paper from your Highways Department. They reported to us exactly as they had reported to all thirteen other NPs; that all devolved local traffic schemes have been delayed by one year due to resource issues. In fact Highways have only been able to deliver 50% of the local traffic schemes that we commissioned and that they accepted during these past 3 years anyway. In their paper we were assured that all would be well by March 2014. This inability to deliver to agreed plans is, we think, undermining a key aspect of our NP and the City Council in our public's eyes. We consulted heavily last September at the Forums and now we have to go back and say sorry we can't deliver.

But later on during the same NP meeting of 25/3 we then considered the Residents' Parking roll out, the 20mph implementation, the pavement widening and highways work for two school annexes and of course the many traffic schemes around the redevelopment of both the cricket ground and the Memorial ground.

So with all that additional new work coming in, added to the need to go up from a 50% delivery level to 100%, plus the need to work off their backlog, we would like an assurance please that much more resource is being put in to this department, otherwise their promise that all will be well by March 2014 is just pie in the sky. Please note that your RPS decision is quite recent and postdates the Highway's paper we refer to. Therefore we think even more resource and an appropriate management system will be needed.

So to conclude we would be grateful for your views and an assurance please that someone will be tasked to look into the reality behind this promise that all will be well by March 2014, as our NP can't see how they are going to do it.

Yours sincerely, on behalf of Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Partnership

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Clive Stevens', with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Clive Stevens (BCR NP Chair)

Cc Di Robinson & Peter Mann



FAO Mr Clive Stevens

Via email: clive.stevens@euronova.co.uk

Reply to	Peter Mann
Telephone	0117 922 2947
Minicom	
Fax	0117 922 4451
E-mail	Peter.Mann@bristol.gov.uk
Our ref	PJM/JEH
Your ref	
Date	30 April 2013

Dear Mr Stevens

Thank you for your letter of 2 April to the Mayor who has asked me to reply on his behalf. I am sorry for the delay in our response and I fully understand your concerns.

The introduction of Neighbourhood Partnerships with devolved budgets for highway works a couple of years ago has generated an unprecedented volume of work. This is because the funding for this work, whilst not particularly significant of itself, is now divided across a multiplicity of schemes, which emerge from an even wider range of options, when previously it was applied to relatively few, larger projects. The decision to defer the current year's delivery programme for 12 months was made in the context of a significant backlog across the city and a desire to give greater confidence in the delivery of local schemes in future, as well as needing to continue to handle residual commitments and emerging work programmes.

We are currently in the process of recruiting to our traffic scheme delivery 'engine room'. This area was depleted significantly last autumn and the north area team did bear the brunt of the loss of experienced, hard to replace, staff. A new Principal Engineer for the north area is due to start with us at the end of May.

The residents' parking project does inevitably impact to an extent on the existing area teams, but the project is also drawing both on resources elsewhere within the City Council and, through recruitment, externally. A big benefit of the resident's parking scheme rollout work is that it provides an opportunity to visit all waiting and loading restrictions in the areas covered, which in many cases should deliver changes and improvements sought by local communities and Neighbourhood Partnerships.

Something else which should help is our intention to transfer much of the responsibility for answering correspondence from the delivery engineers to our Business Support Group. This should free up badly needed time in the right areas to progress schemes to completion.

We have explored the use of consultants as an external delivery resource and in appropriate cases this is a facility which we can draw on. However, the thorny issue of cost is ever present and as costs are higher if consultants are employed and supervised, this is not usually an acceptable option for Neighbourhood Partnership local traffic scheme work.

Continued

I can assure you that we will do our utmost to deliver what is expected of us and that we will always strive to be ambitious but also realistic about what we can achieve.

Yours sincerely



Peter Mann
Service Director, Transport

cc: Cllr Bev Knott
Di Robinson – Neighbourhoods & City Development
Andrew McGrath – Neighbourhoods & City Development

2.0 Resident Parking Schemes. The NP has been involved in numerous meetings recently on the topic of Resident Parking Schemes and has tried to provide a lead for residents and traders' concerns. The following public and NP discussions on RPSs have been held since the March NP meeting (this list is not exhaustive as numerous 1-2-1 meetings have also been held):

- NP 'Superforum' – Saturday 11th May
- Bishopston Forum – Tuesday 14th May
- Informal Task Group – Wednesday 29th May
- Business RPS meeting – Wednesday 22nd May
- NP members meeting with Highways officers – Tuesday 4th June

The meeting notes from the Superforum and the Bishopston forum are set out in the Area Coordinator's Report. The notes from the Informal Task Group and the meeting with Highways officers are set out in **appendix 1** of this report.

2.1 The NP has discussed submitting public statements to the upcoming Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Committee on 20th June (2pm City Hall), and to Cabinet on 27th June (6pm, City Hall – provisional), on the subject of RPSs. Copies of the statement to Scrutiny will be provided at this meeting, and the NP may be asked to discuss and agree either the

content of the statement to Cabinet or what process it will use to provide the statement in time for the meetings.

The NP is asked to note the timescales for submission of statements. Statements to Cabinet and Scrutiny need to be submitted by 12pm on the working day before the meeting.

2.2 Cotham south six month review. The NP is also asked to note the timescales for the residents' six month review consultation on the Cotham south RPS. Residents should receive notification from BCC on or around the 18th June. They will then have until 19th July to submit their comments and opinions.

Members of the NP have also recently made considerable efforts to inform residents in Cotham south of their right to comment on the first six months operation of the RPS (please see attached flier, below). The NP is particularly keen that any lessons learnt from the Cotham south experience are utilised in the roll-out in Cotham north and Redland (and then to the rest of the city). This was perhaps the strongest point made to officers at the recent meeting with NP members.

Copy of the flier delivered to every address in the Cotham south RPS zone

Are you based in the current Cotham (South) CM residential parking zone?



If so, we need your views on your residents parking scheme please. You will soon be asked by the Council about your views and for suggested changes. This is really important, whether you are a resident, local business, school or other, it is your feedback which will be used to improve your scheme and might well be used to shape the operation of the rest of Bristol's zones.



So when you reply to the Council, please copy your response to one or both of your local Councillors:
Anthony.Negus@bristol.gov.uk
Neil.Harrison@bristol.gov.uk

Or: c/o Room 206 City Hall, College Green, Bristol BS1 5TR

We urgently need your views to improve your zone and to plan the new zones for Redland and Cotham (North) – Thank you.

Issued by the Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Partnership.

Residents parking scheme

BCR NP working group discussion 29 May 2013

Present:

Nick Clark, Matt Darley, Neil Harrison, Anthony Negus, Alison Bromilow, Clive Stevens

Draft notes for comment updated 3 June

Strategic principles:

1. The residents' parking scheme principle is intended to solve the problem of **commuters** from outside the city and from outer areas of the city, using residential and retail centre streets in the inner zones for day long parking in order to then travel to work in central Bristol.
The scheme must be designed so that it does not stop people coming into the resident's parking areas to work or shop, because this will undermine the character of these areas, the aim of achieving mixed, balanced and sustainable communities with local amenities and work opportunities and healthy sustainable local retail centres.
2. We regret that the residents' parking scheme is not being designed as part of an **overall integrated transport plan**, with improvements to public transport as an essential part of the solution.
3. The **introduction** of residents' parking schemes must be supported by help for existing residents and businesses to adapt to the new system eg
 - a. by providing assistance with eg car sharing solutions to help with decreasing their need for private car use.
 - b. by bringing in the operating scheme over say 5 years to allow alternative modes of travel to be worked out/ brought in
 - c. numbers of business passes / resident's eligibility for residential passes to be reduced on an annual basis to an optimum working level

This will ensure that residents and businesses do not suffer hardship or loss of business/trade to the detriment of the sustainability of the local areas. It is not reasonable or viable to expect people to change their transport habits instantly, a changeover period must be designed to prevent undue hardship and until the public transport system is improved and can support their needs.

4. All residents' parking schemes need to be assessed area by area through consultation to establish operating systems that are appropriate for the particular needs of that community. A RPS must at least be responsive to local feedback in order to comply with **minimum standards of consultation**.

Operating systems:

1. **Shopping areas** need to have solutions designed to support their particular character. A minimum of 30 minutes free parking is necessary. Some pay and display only parking areas may need to operate on Saturdays in order for the retail areas to remain viable. A method of assessing and agreeing local

operating systems needs to be drawn up to cover all the different Bristol RPS areas. The wrong operating system will mean businesses will close or relocate.

2. Certain **businesses** require car parking for longer than 3 hours eg garages, hotels, and hairdressers. Solutions such as 'day passes' for customers using these businesses should be adopted in order to prevent the loss of these businesses from the area, making the community less sustainable.
3. Some **businesses** will need larger numbers of employee passes at the outset in order to continue to operate eg schools / nurseries / some businesses. This may reduce in time (see 3 above) but this needs to be brought in slowly to avoid undue hardship / loss of these businesses.
4. Some **traders** eg building trade, estate agents, peripatetic music teachers etc operate city wide and need a **Bristol wide** pass in order to continue to operate. Passes limited to small numbers of zones are not appropriate.
5. **Start times** for parking zones should be based on stopping commuter parking but not impacting on local community essential travel. A 9.30 start time will prevent commuters parking at the start of their day but will allow eg parents to deliver children to school and nurseries without restrictions. This will support the local community without undermining the aim of reducing commuter parking.
6. **Local amenities** such as **sports clubs, parks and allotments** need to have areas where people can park for free periods in order not to disadvantage some sections of the community and to accommodate people visiting for eg sports matches
7. **Special cases** must be allowed for. Eg Charities and community organisations which are neither local residents nor businesses. These are an important part of our community and need to be catered for so that we do not lose them.
8. Residents' parking permits should be offered at the outset to all current local residents including residents in **private roads**. These may be reduced in number or totally withdrawn over time. New residential schemes may not be eligible for on street parking but existing schemes must not be excluded. It is not reasonable to expect people to change their transport habits instantly, a changeover period must be designed to prevent undue hardship.
9. Specific consideration must be given to how the system will affect **temporary residents** eg student residents who may not have their cars registered at their term time addresses. A operating system for these sectors of the population must be worked out in detail before the system is brought into operation.
10. Clarity is needed about cost and what restriction there is on future increasing costs, what happens to the income, how many passes will be available to each business and resident depending on the amount of private off road parking is available to them, and hours of operation. Lack of clarity is causing confusion and generating wider opposition.

Alison Bromilow 3 June 2013

Notes from meeting between BCR NP reps and BCC Highways Officers regarding the consultation on the Cotham (north) and Redland Resident Parking Scheme (RPS) consultation. Tuesday 4th June 2013.

1. Cllr Negus expressed his concern that councillors appear to be completely ignored when trying to contribute their views on the RPS process
2. Officers explained that they are now catching the views of residents and that the res.parking email address is now being managed by a designated staff member
3. The Cotham South 6 month review ought to have started on 1st June but hasn't. Clive explained that they had leafleted the area and therefore there would be high expectations from residents. It needs to be made clear to residents when it will start.
4. Cllr Negus expressed much concern that this delay will have a knock-on delay for everything else.
5. Residents will have approximately a 3 week period to submit their thoughts
6. Officers were told that the date of the review needs to be set a.s.a.p. It was agreed that the date would be circulated by end of Wednesday 5th June.
7. The ideal scenario is that the results of the Cotham South review will inform the Cotham north/Redland (CN/R) consultation and implementation. Highways officers explained that this would be done where possible but that the timescales do not make this as clean as it could be.
8. Attendees expressed their dissatisfaction about what they consider to be the irrationality of this. Proper data is needed to understand what is needed, what works, doesn't work etc.
9. Officers stated that the overall programme will remain as published even though it has had a slower start than envisaged.
10. There then followed a more detailed discussion about specific aspects of the proposed schemes. These included EU law on free movement; number plate registration; HMOs; number of permits to be permitted per residence; primary and secondary retail frontage; people who live in certain wards not necessarily being included in RPSs at same stage as other ward residents; problems with calling RPS areas by certain names and how this causes confusion; parking on 1 or both sides of roads, depending on road widths; parking near parks and other amenities; 30 minutes free parking rather than 15 minutes. *(please note that detailed notes of these discussions are available but haven't been reproduced in detail here)*
11. There is a communications strategy. Peter Holt, Director of Communications is leading on this. This strategy will be produced in time for the Scrutiny (20th June) and Full Council (18th June) meetings
12. Officers are looking at all opportunities to find the best way to proceed on RPSs. However, with the six month reviews, i mustn't be forgotten that these are mainly for fine tuning, not for fundamental re-examination of principles
13. Cllr Negus emphasised the importance of getting things right first time in order to avoid having to tear things out when they are found not to be working.
14. There then followed a discussion regarding the likely implementation time of the CN/R schemes. Completion date is now March 2014. Cllr Negus expressed his outrage that these dates were a delay on what he'd been previously informed by senior Highways Officers. Cotham residents will be very upset about this.

15. Highways officers suggested that the CN part of this implementation was likely to be sooner than this end date, as it was the first of the rollout areas. It may well be launched before Christmas. The work period is from 7th November to 7th March
16. The discussion then concentrated on principles (see attached principles paper).
17. People working in RPS areas (as opposed to parking there and going on to work elsewhere) need to be catered for. A balance needs to be struck.
18. A congestion charge would have been a more effective way of dealing with commuters rather than making residents pay for a problem that isn't of their own making.
19. Reps suggested the RPSs should be introduced gradually. Longer-term is better than cold turkey. People need time to adjust to the new system and change their behaviour. It was suggested that if drivers are considered to be part of the problem, they should be invited to help find the solution as well. But this can't be done overnight.