

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL  
CABINET**

**21<sup>st</sup> July 2011**

**Report of:** Service Director, Transport

**Title:** Residents' Parking Scheme update

**Ward:** Citywide

**Officer Presenting Report:** Peter Mann, Service Director, Transport

**Contact Telephone Number:** (0117) 922 2947

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. To agree that a statutory consultation process regarding the proposed amendments to the Kingsdown Residents' Parking Scheme (RPS) detailed in this report is carried out.
2. To agree to engage with Neighbourhood Partnerships to seek their views regarding the development of potential schemes in other areas.

**Summary**

The Kingsdown Residents' Parking Scheme became operational on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2011. Officers have been carrying out a review of the scheme, in conjunction with ward members and local residents, to identify any operational issues and to establish where minor amendments to the scheme would be appropriate.

The vast majority of the feedback that has been received has been positive, which has demonstrated that RPS areas can bring significant benefits to local communities. Feedback from outside the Kingsdown area indicates that other communities face similar parking problems to those experienced by Kingsdown residents prior to the introduction of the scheme. In light of this, the report also considers the potential to engage with these communities regarding the development of other RPS areas.

### **The significant issues in the report are:**

- The positive response to the Kingsdown RPS.
- The proposal to proceed to statutory consultation in order to promote the possibility of making minor amendments to the scheme.
- The proposal to engage Neighbourhood Partnerships in discussions regarding the potential to develop residents' parking schemes for other local communities.

## **Policy**

1. RPS areas can improve neighbourhoods by enabling residents, businesses and their visitors to park more easily. This can lead to improved air quality and a safer environment, due to the reduction in unsafe parking and vehicles circling the area searching for a space.
2. Effective demand management, including the introduction of RPS areas, is a key component of sustainable urban transport policy. By restricting commuter parking in residential areas, the introduction of RPS areas can make a significant contribution towards tackling congestion, improving road safety and air quality and increasing the use of public transport and cycling by reducing the number of people commuting into the city by private car. The Joint Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2026 provides a framework for introducing residents' parking as part of the integrated transport strategy for the sub-region.

## **Consultation**

### **3. Internal**

Ward members for Cabot and Cotham wards  
Parking Services

### **4. External**

In May 2011, all households and businesses within the Kingsdown RPS area were contacted to invite feedback on the scheme. The majority of responses received were from individuals, but some were from local community groups and organisations, as follows:

Kingsdown Conservation Group  
Rowantree Kindergarden  
Highbury Residents' Association  
Bristol Community Family Trust  
University of Bristol

## Context

### Kingsdown RPS

5. The Kingsdown RPS covers an area of approximately 2,800 households and 300 businesses. It aims to prioritise the available parking in the area for the use of residents, businesses and their visitors. This is achieved through the introduction and enforcement of a permit system. To provide flexibility for residents and to facilitate better access to local businesses and community facilities, some pay & display parking is also provided within the area.

6. The scheme became operational on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2011. Officers have been monitoring it since its implementation in order to assess its impact on the area and to identify any issues that need to be resolved.

### Feedback from residents

7. In May 2011, a letter was sent to each property within the RPS area to invite feedback about the scheme. This generated a very positive response. 216 responses were received, of which 146 were positive comments about the scheme, 10 were negative and 60 were requesting minor amendments.

8. Local ward members carried out a separate survey in Cabot ward, which found that 79.4% of the 117 respondents are now in favour of the scheme, whereas only 56.4% of them had been supportive of it prior to its introduction. 21 respondents were undecided prior to the introduction of the scheme; of these, 17 are now supportive.

9. A complete list of the responses received is included as Appendix A of the report. The key benefits that the local community have reported are summarised below:

- Greater community cohesion as residents are less stressed and are more communicative with one another;
- Improved quality of life as residents find it much easier to use their car when they need to without worrying about being able to park it again afterwards;
- The streets are quieter and safer now that vehicles are not circling the area searching for a parking space, particularly early in the mornings;
- It is easier and safer for pedestrians to walk around the neighbourhood;
- Access to properties has improved, which has benefited people with limited mobility and will ensure access for emergency vehicles and deliveries is as easy as possible;
- The introduction of pay & display has improved access to local amenities, particularly as parking is free for the first 15 minutes.

**10.** As mentioned in paragraph 7, a number of residents have requested that amendments be made to the scheme. Officers have considered each request, as well as feedback from ward members and community groups, and are proposing to make several changes to the scheme as a result. These fall into five broad categories:

- Minor changes to individual roads, for example increasing or decreasing the lengths of parking places and / or double yellow lines (see Appendix B).
- The conversion of some permit-holders only parking places to shared use parking facilities, which can be used by either permit holders or people using pay & display facilities (see Appendix B).
- Broader changes that affect the way in which the scheme is operated and administered, for example changes to permit eligibility criteria (see Appendix C).
- Increasing the maximum stay in pay & display parking places from two hours to three hours throughout the scheme area.
- Minor amendments to the relevant Order to ensure that it matches the on-site installation of lines and signs (see Appendix D).

**11.** A list of the proposed changes is attached as Appendices B-D. Each proposed change requires an amendment to the Order for the scheme. Approval is sought to proceed to statutory consultation regarding the proposed amendments to the Order.

**12.** Overall, the reaction to the introduction of the scheme has been extremely positive and demonstrates that such schemes can deliver significant benefits to local communities as well as meeting policy objectives.

### **Additional RPS areas and the role of Neighbourhood Partnerships**

**13.** The Council is aware that many other communities close to the city centre are experiencing parking problems that are comparable to those that existed in Kingsdown prior to the introduction of the scheme.

**14.** Indeed, since the Kingsdown scheme has been in operation, a number of requests have been received for the consideration of similar arrangements to be put in place in other local communities. An initial assessment has been carried out of potential RPS areas.

**15.** Cotham, St Paul's, Redcliff and Easton/St Philip's have been identified as local areas where residents' parking schemes could potentially be delivered.

**16.** In addition to this, discussions are underway with the North Bristol NHS Trust regarding the development of Southmead Hospital; similar controls could be considered on residential streets surrounding the site.

17. Neighbourhood Partnerships potentially have a key role in marshalling such requests, triggering community engagement and providing key input to the development and approval of proposals should the principle be supported.

## **Proposal**

### **Kingsdown RPS**

18. As outlined earlier in the report, all households and businesses located within the Kingsdown RPS were invited to provide feedback on the operation of the scheme and to request that amendments be made to it. In addition to this, discussions were held with local ward members and other interested parties such as the Kingsdown Conservation Group in order to identify anything that may need improving in order for the scheme to operate as effectively as possible and provide the maximum benefit to the local community.
19. The vast majority of the responses received during this process were positive, with some residents and businesses that had originally been opposed to its introduction being fully supportive of it now that it is in place.
20. However, the Council received a number of requests to make changes to the scheme. Each request was fully considered by officers and has resulted in a proposal to take some of these amendments forwards to statutory consultation. The amendments that it is proposed to take through this process are set out in detail in Appendices B-D.
21. Appendix C lists four proposed changes to the way in which the scheme operates. The rationale behind these proposals is discussed below.

### **Eligibility criteria for business permits**

22. Business permits are provided to enable vehicles that are used for operational business need, as opposed to commuting to work, to park within the scheme area. When the scheme was introduced, the eligibility criteria required the applicant to have the vehicle registered in the name of the business. In practice, many businesses found it difficult to meet this requirement. Therefore, it is recommended that applicants could provide confirmation that the vehicle is insured for business use as an acceptable alternative.

### **Permits for landlords**

23. Officers have received several requests for permits from landlords who

own a property in the scheme area but live outside the area. As they are not based within the scheme area, they have not been eligible for permits and have had to rely on obtaining visitors' permits from tenants or utilising pay & display facilities in order to visit their property. It is proposed that the scheme be amended to enable the owner of a property within the scheme area to purchase one business permit at the standard cost of £100 per annum. Owners of several properties would be able to purchase 1 permit for every 10 properties that they own, up to a maximum of 10 permits.

### **Pay & display provision**

24. When the scheme was introduced, a maximum stay limit of two hours was applied throughout the scheme area to facilitate turnover of spaces. The Council has received some requests to extend this to cater for people attending classes that last for two hours and therefore need to park in the area for slightly longer than that. It is proposed to increase the maximum stay to three hours throughout the scheme area.
25. The scheme was designed to prioritise the majority of parking spaces for permit holders, ie residents, businesses and their visitors. A small quantity of pay & display bays and bays that could be used by either permit holders or pay & display customers were also included to provide some flexibility to the scheme and increase access to local amenities. Since the operation of the scheme began, officers have received several requests to increase the availability of pay & display parking in the area, as this increases the overall flexibility of the scheme in terms of providing for visitors. With this in mind, officers are proposing to change the type of parking provided in some locations from permit holders only bays to shared use bays. These proposals are set out in detail in Appendix B.

### **Visitors' permits**

26. Each household within the scheme area is eligible to apply for up to 100 days of visitors' permits per annum, with additional permits being made available to residents with specific care needs. It is felt that this limit is appropriate overall. However, it has been found that it is causing some difficulties in instances where residents move into a property part-way through the year and have found that the previous occupants have already used the household's annual allocation. As the permits are not vehicle specific, there is a risk of undermining the scheme if multiple allocations are issued to the same household during the year. However, officers recognise that this could leave new residents in a difficult position. To resolve this, it is proposed that up to 50 permits be made available to new residents at a cost of £1 per permit.

## **Additional RPS areas**

27. Potential RPS areas have been identified in Cotham, St Paul's, Redcliff and Easton/St Philip's. In addition, discussions are underway with the North Bristol NHS Trust regarding the development of Southmead Hospital. Similar proposals could be considered for the residential streets surrounding the site.
28. It is proposed to approach each of the relevant neighbourhood partnerships to seek their views on the potential for schemes. As with Kingsdown, if any scheme were to come forward for implementation, it would be subject to an operational review during its first six months.

## **Other Options Considered**

### **Kingsdown RPS**

29. Some of the requests for changes to the scheme are not recommended to be put forwards as part of this process. These are set out below.

### **Operating hours**

30. The Kingsdown RPS operates from 9am – 5pm Monday – Friday. The Council received 33 requests to amend its operating hours; of these, 30 were in favour of extending the hours and three requested that they be reduced. In addition, 18 people commented that there are parking problems outside the hours of operation, either in the evenings, on weekends or both.
31. There was no consensus about how to change the operating hours and the number of requests compared to the number of households within the scheme is small. On this basis, it is not proposed to make any changes to the operating hours of the scheme.

### **Pay & display provision**

32. Various comments and requests were made regarding the provision of pay & display facilities within the scheme. Some of these were not considered to be suitable, such as enabling people to purchase time slots of less than an hour and removing pay & display from the scheme. As outlined above, feedback received regarding a number of issues suggested that increasing pay & display provision is appropriate, as it provides greater flexibility for residents and businesses to accommodate

visitors. It is also generally felt that the charge of £1 per hour with the option of a free 15 minute stay is appropriate.

### **Visitors' permits**

33. A number of changes to the way in which visitors' permits are operated were requested. These included making permits valid for a 24 hour period rather than one day; making the permits available in half hourly or hourly slots; making less permits available and making more permits available. On balance, it is considered that the number of permits that each household is entitled to is appropriate.
34. Officers feel that the issue of making the permits available for time periods of less than one day would be beneficial to the scheme as it provides greater flexibility, in that residents will not have to use up a ticket that could last a day if someone visits for an hour or two. However, the introduction of a system that enables visiting time to be bought in hours rather than days is likely to require the introduction of new technology. Therefore, it is not proposed that any changes be made as part of this review; instead, officers have undertaken to investigate options regarding the potential to introduce this system.

### **Permits for tradespeople**

35. Officers have received some requests to make permits available for tradespeople working on properties throughout the area. This has been carefully considered, but it is felt that the provision of additional pay & display facilities, the increase in maximum stay time to three hours and the existing ability to suspend a parking place at a cost of £52 per week should be sufficient to meet the requirements of residents and businesses who need to have work carried out.
36. In addition, some requests for changes to parking provision have not been brought forward in this report. This is often because officers have received opposing views about how to manage parking in a particular street, or because the request made cannot be met for technical reasons. Wherever possible, officers have sought to accommodate requests to ensure that the scheme meets the requirements of the local community.

### **Additional RPS areas**

37. An initial assessment has been carried out of some twenty possible additional RPS areas. This has considered issues such as the impact of unnecessary commuter traffic on the network, indications of support drawn from the outcome of previous consultation as well as more



recently expressed support and the overall benefit that a scheme could bring to the area.

## **Risk Assessment**

38. Other changes to the Kingsdown RPS were carefully considered during the course of the review of the scheme. The reasons for not making these changes are set out in paragraphs 30-36.

## **Public Sector Equality Duties**

- 8a) Before making a decision, section 149 Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following “protected characteristics”: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:
- i) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.
  - ii) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to --
    - remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic;
    - take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it (in relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities);
    - encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
  - iii) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to –
    - tackle prejudice; and
    - promote understanding.
- 8b) A draft screening Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed for the Residents' Parking Scheme (see Appendix E). Although equality issues have been previously raised with reference to the needs of older people and the disabled who may need to have care / support

from either family, friends or organisations, it has been possible to mitigate these by increasing the number of permits provided so therefore it has not been necessary at this stage to progress to a full equalities impact assessment.

Monitoring of the current scheme will be necessary to help establish positive and negative elements that will then help to inform future schemes in other areas.

Further equalities work with stakeholders may need to be progressed as possible proposals move forward and consideration is given to further areas where the scheme could be implemented. The outcome of this work will help determine whether or not a full equalities impact assessment will need to be completed.

### **Environmental checklist**

An ecological impact assessment was conducted before the Kingsdown RPS was implemented; this was presented to the Council's Cabinet in July 2010. The assessment has been considered in light of the proposed changes to the scheme outlined in this report and is still applicable. Therefore, a full re-assessment has not been required.

### **Legal and Resource Implications**

#### **Legal**

The Council, as local traffic and highway authority for the whole of its area, has a key role to play in delivering the policies and objectives of the Joint Local Transport Plan. In devising a residents' parking scheme, the Council must exercise its powers taking into account lawful considerations with the aim of traffic management policy.

In this context, the Council also needs to be mindful of its network management duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004. Briefly, this duty obliges local traffic authorities to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable (having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives) to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on its road network. This may involve the exercise of any power to regulate or co-ordinate the uses made of any road in the network. This has an obvious relevance in connection with residents' parking schemes.

The relevant statutory basis for establishing a residents' parking scheme requires the promotion of an order under the Road traffic regulation Act 1984. However, this process can include a preliminary non-statutory consultation exercise to assist in preliminary design principles. This report addresses the feed back from such a preliminary consultation.

The promotion of an order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 must be in accordance with the prescribed statutory procedures, namely: the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. These procedures involve in due course advertisement of the proposals and invitation of objections. The Council is under a legal duty to consider any objections received in response to the statutory consultation process before the relevant decision-maker (such as the Council's Cabinet) can make any decision. This report seeks Cabinet endorsement to proceed with such consultation.

**(Legal advice provided by Peter Malarby, Senior Solicitor, Highways & Transport)**

## **Financial**

### **(a) Revenue**

**The proposed amendments to the scheme will not reduce the net levels of operating surpluses previously forecast. The Scheme costs were to be repaid from these surpluses over a five year period and this will therefore remain the case**

### **(b) Capital**

**The costs of the proposed amendments can be met from the funding currently available for the Scheme**

**Financial advice given by:** Mike Harding, Finance Business Partner, Neighbourhoods and City Development

### **Land**

Not applicable

### **Personnel**

Not applicable.

## **Appendices:**

- Appendix A – General feedback about the Kingsdown RPS.
- Appendix B – Proposed amendments to parking provision in the Kingsdown RPS.
- Appendix C – Proposed amendments to the operation of the Kingsdown RPS.
- Appendix D – Proposed amendments to the TRO to ensure that it precisely reflects the lines and signs on site.
- Appendix E – Equalities Impact Assessment

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**  
**Background Papers:**

None.

Ref.	Road	For - General Comments	Against - General Comments
128	Alfred Hill	Delighted. No downsides.	
130	Armada House	Converted. Scheme has been fantastic.	
155	Armada House	Success.	
124	Back of Kingsdown Parade	Good scheme in general.	
139	Clare Rd	Scheme success, streets feel safer.	
254	Clare Road	Great success, has solved the problem of commuter parking.	
152	Clevedon Terrace	Massive improvement.	
247	Cotham Brow	Delighted by the transformation of the area, more peaceful, less stressed, residents now say 'hello' to one another more.	
252	Cotham Rd	On the whole has been positive for the school. Have an average of 70 children arriving and being collected and the 15mins free seems to work well.	
234	Cotham Road	Was against, now for it.	
161	Cotham Road	Reduced the 'pressured' feeling in the mornings. Not noticed a change in air quality, but it seems like a nicer place to live now. In the evenings you can tell that people (suspects mainly students) have re-thought their need for cars as there are fewer cars parked in the area – its lovely.	
239	Cotham Road	Absolutely wonderful.	
225	Cotham Road South	Support its continuation.	
105	Cotham Side	Best thing since arrived in '96, safer, Council should be proud, hope other commuter-blighted residential areas will follow, affordable, enhanced amenity.	
193	Dove Street	Works well during the day.	
199	Dove Street	A success. Can now park near home. Commends the council for imposing it.	
95	Dove Street	Big thank you.	
233	Dove Street	Fully in favour of the new system.	
120	Dove Street	Rds safer, reduction in traffic, visitor permits work well, air quality improved, good value for money.	
177	Freemantle House	Lady whose father has poor health and for years she has been struggling to help with the shopping or getting him in the car. Scheme has been a godsend, it's the best decision. Big thank you.	
141	Freemantle Road	Scheme introduced a couple of months after they moved there and the before and after comparison is sharp. Quieter, safer, parking much easier.	
127	Freemantle Road	Much better than proposed.	
150	Freemantle Road	Effects have been dramatic, street is quieter and no longer fear moving the car during the day.	
103	Freemantle Road	An astounding success!	
213	Freemantle Road	Greatly improved the area. Thank you.	
265	Freemantle Square	Approval and support. Beneficial to the access and safety of the streets.	
147	Freemantle Square	Safer, cleaner, don't use car much but happy to pay for own parking and for visitors.	
133	Freemantle Square	Convert.	
185	Freemantle Road	Great success, radically improved the neighbourhood.	
218	High Kingsdown	Scheme is working well and life for businesses and residents is less traumatic. Thank you.	
162	High Kingsdown	Pleased with the scheme, there is no doubt it has improved the traffic situation and the quality of life for local residents.	

145	High Kingsdown	Delighted.	
245	High Kingsdown	very much likes the scheme. In particular being able to give visitors and tradespeople day permits.	
232	High Kingsdown	Did her best to forestall scheme, but now is converted.	
121	High Kingsdown	Finding it great.	
231	High Kingsdown	Has been a success. No longer looks like a scrapyard.	
249	High Kingsdown	Huge improvement – reduced noise and fumes, no more illegal parking, more space to walk in, less dodging of traffic (which was continuous throughout the day).	
237	High Kingsdown	Long may the scheme last. CEO's have been polite, helpful and easy to get along with.	
107	High Kingsdown	Shopkeepers say trade hasn't suffered as customers can access parking more easily, CEO's patrol regularly, access clear for emergency vehicles, scheme is a huge success.	
208	High Kingsdown	Support. Increase in parking spaces in the day is great. DYL outside High Kingsdown flat's garages have been very effective so far.	
235	High Kingsdown	Very pleased.	
240	High Kingsdown	Working very well.	
167	Highbury Villas	Were strong supporters, now even more delighted with how scheme is working. Safer, peaceful, easier access, etc. Fears that there would not be enough parking for residents have proved unfounded.	
219	Highbury Villas	Seems to be working surprisingly well.	
164	Highbury Villas	Complete success. No longer woken by commuters circling the area for parking spaces. Street scene and quality of environment improved. It may also be deterring students from bringing cars.	
159	Highbury Villas	Excellent scheme. Possible to get in and out of Highbury Villas without all the trouble before, emergency vehicles would be able to get in, easier for deliveries, thinks trade will have increased for the shops due to increase in P&D parking.	
163	Highbury Villas	It is now possible to get in and out of Highbury Villas with ease. Can now manage her day to suit her business, not parking. Less aggressive circling of cars looking to park. DYL on corners have enabled emergency vehicles to get through.	
180	Highbury Villas	Quieter, easier to cross the road, safer for children going to school, bin men can empty the rubbish. A much better place to live.	
146	Highbury Villas	Road now quiet rather than chaotic, parking fine during the day, workmen and deliveries easier, students are bringing less cars, traders seem happy as the 2 hr parking is being observed. Has improved quality of life.	
149	Highbury Villas, Maycroft Cottage	As a whole, scheme is working well.	
104	Horfield Road	Scheme has improved life in the area immensely.	
117	Jamaica St		Sarcastic email, doesn't seem impressed.
241	Jamaica St		Overall feels that the numerous extra costs amount to an unfair tax on his business for being located in the area, and the whole situation has prompted him to evaluate relocation to another part of the city.
270	Kingsdown Parade	Generally working well.	
243	Kingsdown Parade	Pollution from cruising cars has gone, and a tranquillity that was unknown before has set in.	

94	Kingsdown Parade	Takes back doubts, job well done. Thinks 1 book of tickets would be enough per household.	
136	Kingsdown Parade	Worked well and has made a big difference.	
188	Kingsdown Parade	Has been beneficial. A lot of businesses in area supported the 'No Campaign', but trade doesn't appear to have been affected.	
269	Kingsdown Parade	Outstanding success. Reduction of noise and fumes in the morning has been an unexpected benefit.	
187	Kingsdown Parade	Great success	
262	Kingsdown Parade	Has reduced the number of vehicles circulating the area looking for a space.	
253	Kingsdown Parade	Visitors can park easier, can leave during the day and know they can park when they return, fewer cars travelling around the area.	
181	Kingsdown Parade	Has been beneficial.	
189	Kingsdown Parade	Works extremely well during hours of operation.	
192	Kingsdown Parade	Works amazingly well. Guest/traders tickets work well. Tranquil streets. Even the diehard 'NO'ists say it is working far better than they would have thought.	
229	Kingsdown Parade	A converted doubting Thomas, not spoken to a single resident who is not delighted with the change in the area.	
99	Kingsdown Parade	A very good scheme for the area.	
211	Kingsdown Parade	Delighted with scheme in its present format. No morning in-fighting for spaces, improvement in air quality and safety.	
228	Kingsdown Parade	Implementation has improved the environment beyond expectations. Movement of traffic is greatly reduced. Weekends remind them of how bad situations was. Number of permits issued per house should not be increased. Would advocate spread of scheme to other inner areas of the city.	
126	Kingsdown Parade	Is great. Thank you.	
143	Kingsdown Parade	Very pleased with scheme, traffic is reduced, safer, easier to park.	
137	kingsdown Parade		Has not made it easier to park in the evenings. May have reduced cars in the area, but not city as a whole so environmental claim is unknown. Kingsdown residents should not pay more than other residents.
169	Kingsdown Parade	Signage good, pleased that it is being enforced. Thanks to those involved with implementing the scheme for their perseverance and patience in the face of some totally unwarranted and unacceptable abuse.	
190	Kingsdown Parade	Achieves its aims.	
157	Kingsdown Parade	Doesn't really affect them, but neighbours feedback is that it is welcomed and working.	
261	Marlborough Hill Place	Great success.	
246	Marlborough Hill Place	Overall scheme is welcomed by his family.	
264	Montague Hill	Strongly support, it's improved the environment, houses can use their garages, kids can play in the streets.	
194	Myrtle Road	Originally against, but during hours of operation works perfectly. Please extend.	
154	Nugent Hill		Unnecessary, poorly designed, grossly unfair and abysmally implemented.
195	Oxford Street		One of the worst pieces of local legislation ever produced and would vote to have it removed if at all possible.

151	Portland Street	Relief. More than achieved aims. Improved environment and look of area. Safer. Deliveries and refuse collection easier. Cynics won over. Traders business has improved. Do not increase permit numbers per household. All those who campaigned and worked on introduction of scheme should be congratulated, and hope neighbouring wards/areas will get the same support from BCC (albeit in a shorter timescale).	
182	Portland Street	It has been a pleasure to be able to find parking, although the spaces are under used between 9 and 5.	
207	Portland Street	There has been a great improvement since the scheme was introduced. Parking, less noise, pollution and congestion. It has become more residential rather than a big car park.	
153	Somerset Street	Immense benefit. Air quality improved, space for residents, visitors, careers. Fewer cars parked dangerously on corners. Exit and entrance to area improved. And thanks to the CEO's who are patrolling in an efficient but friendly manner.	
216	Somerset Street	Positive difference to parking in Kingsdown. Easier and less congested. Great success.	
244	Somerset Street	Has made a huge difference.	
214	Somerset Street	Scheme has proved very successful, some tweaks needed to improve further, but fully supportive or at least keeping what they have.	
257	Somerset Street	Mixed blessing, better by day but worse in the evenings.	
173	Somerset Street	Originally voted against, now wonders why he did.	
205	Somerset Street	Supported it for 10 years and the results have exceeded expectations. Does not propose any changes for Somerset St.	
171	Somerset Street	Has made a huge impact.	
115	Somerset Street	Converted! Didn't change parking much for her, it has massively reduced traffic in the local streets.	
183	Somerset Street	Extremely beneficial. Even people originally opposed to it are now expressing satisfaction.	
226	Somerset Street	Overall, seems to be working successfully in its objectives.	
142	Somerset Street	Easy to park, less traffic, easy to purchase additional visitor permits.	
92	Somerset Street	Had misgivings, but now feel privileged. Traffic has decreased, now ample space for residents, visitors and tradesmen.	
209	Somerset Street	Lives at the wide part of the Rd and people were always turning there when they couldn't find a place to park. This has now stopped. Street is quieter, restful, more residential. Have a garage, but sees that neighbours who don't have a garage benefit greatly.	
260	Spring Hill	Situation is infinitely better than it was.	
273	Spring Hill	Less pollution, safer place, emergency vehicles can get in, all areas are different so a factor of success has been the involvement of local councillors who have listened.	
175	Spring Hill	Admirers of the scheme, but are about to fall foul of the number of visitors permits.	
255	Spring Hill	Its been wonderful to able to use their garage for the first time in 40 years, nearby Rds are no longer blocked by corner parking, present time limits are convenient,	



222	St Matthews Avenue	Scheme has made Kingsdown a much more pleasant place to live.	
206	St Matthews Rd	It has changed our lives. Less traffic, more accessible, quieter.	
198	St Matthews Rd	SEVEN DAY RPZ NOW!!!!!!	
138	St Matthews Rd		Thinks we will claim success as displaced parking will mean other areas will want RPS.
165	St Matthews Rd	Scheme is excellent, points inc. Can park in their street in the day, street is emptier in the day so feels more pleasant, less traffic, DYL have made junctions safer. Hope other areas of Bristol who have resisted scheme take heart from the experience in Kingsdown.	
230	St Matthews Road	Scheme has been very successful.	
144	St Michael's Hill	Always knew it would be beneficial.	
236	Thomas Street	Have lived there 30 years and never seen it so good.	
256	Tyndalls Park Mews	Almost complete success. New atmosphere of community.	
200	Victoria Gardens	Generally welcome the scheme.	
251	Victoria Gardens	Very pleased with the scheme.	
119	Woodland Rd	Hugely beneficial. Quieter, safer, less instances of drive being blocked.	
170	All	Has brought considerable benefits.	
91	All	Parking easy, things fees are fair. Grateful.	
108	All	Overall a change for the better.	
90	All	Best thing to happen to the area in a long time. Makes visitor parking easier.	
242	All	Terrific improvement. For elderly folk who need careers this has been great as has stopped them arriving late and frazzled as they drive around looking for space.	
140	All	Parking easier, was ticketed twice and successfully appealed twice (i.e. appeals process seems fair), easier to get round the tight corners.	
97	All	Congratulations, scheme is a success.	
125	All	Can see the benefits.	
131	All	Thank you x3. Traffic is less.	
100	All	Area lot quieter and nicer. Would recommend to all other areas of Bristol.	
250	All	On the whole and excellent job.	
166	All	Solved commuter parking problem, reduced amount of drivers cruising around for a space, empty streets during the day is a clear signal to commuters that parking in central Bristol is becoming increasingly difficult, it was installed and implemented very quickly and efficiently, visitor ticket system works very well.	
102	All	Best traffic based thing to happen to Kingsdown.	
160	All	Happy with it.	
109	All	Greatly enhanced the atmosphere on the main streets, and made life easier for tradespeople.	
172	All	Delighted. Traffic lighter, and less speeding cars. Vouchers and cost work, not heard anyone complain. A*!	
129	All	Quieter neighbourhood. Parking at local shops rarely resorts to pavement parking now.	
197	All	Scheme is brilliant.	
191	All	Works well during the day.	
215	All	Has improved parking in the area and traffic has been reduced making it safer and far more pleasant.	

202	All	Greatly improved parking, reduced pollution, safer for children, better visibility, visitors and tradesmen can park more easily. There are many converts.	
123	All	On the whole it is easier for the patients.	
201	All	Delighted with scheme, made lives easier, area is quieter and safer.	
112	All	Meeting its aims.	
176	All	On the whole the system seems to be working.	
174	All		Very disappointed by the implementation and especially the non-majority vote that brought this scheme.
122	All	Was going to move as felt trapped as an OAP, as couldn't park when returning.	
114	All	Always a supporter, but has exceeded expectations.	
220	All	It is brilliant. Why didn't we have this 10 years ago. Rules and tariffs for 1st, 2nd and 3rd cars are right. Less parking on corners, and it discourages people driving to town.	
248	All	Pleasantly surprised by the positive difference.	
111	All	Success	
178	All	A roaring success.	
106	All	Cleaner air, easier for shopping. Still issues during evenings and weekends, but great scheme and many thanks for doing it.	
113	All	Comments favourably. Parking easy, and visitors and tradesmen calling less of a problem.	
224	All	Converted objector, delighted with scheme.	
110	All	Don't change anything. Delighted. DYL easing flow. Less litter, cleaner air, roads safer. Presence of CEO's adds security, thinking of giving them honorary Neighbourhood Watch membership.	
158	All	Massive thank you. Convenient, safer and quieter.	
156	All	Not much doubt that it is a success. Evenings and weekends are little better than before, but street is quieter. Visiting plumbers etc are glad of the ticketing system, unlike Bath which they hate.	
116	All	Rds are less frantic and dangerous, space to park (except evenings), air is clearer. Safer for kids to walk to school, improved quality of life.	
134	All	Resounding success.	
148	All	Scheme appears to be working effectively. Well done.	
132	All	Would recommend to other residents. It is also easier to park outside the restrictions.	
93	All		Waste of time, not properly policed, no problem before, where can Drs and nurses park, should concentrate on cleaning up rubbish, and doesn't want to be written to again.
259	All		Unhappy, outside area, thinks it is discrimination against working people, cheap at £30, students fault as no issue in holidays, not safe for women to walk to their cars at night, busses are unsuitable for the 21st Century.
274	All	Welcomes the significant reduction in vehicles circulating the area during the normal working day.	

## Appendix B: Proposed changes to parking provision

Location	Length	Comments
Alfred Place, outside The Bell PH	12.5m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only.
Alfred Place, garage forecourt at Portland Street end.	5m	New permit holders' only bays to replace double yellow lines.
6 Clare Road	4m	Remove double yellow lines from access.
81 Cotham Brow	10m	Remove double yellow lines from access.
Cotham Brow, adjacent to No 86	28m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only.
Cotham Road	10m	Parking bays removed to facilitate bus stop relocation.
Cotham Road, next to relocated bus stop	23m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only bays.
Cotham Road South		Relocate loading bay by 20m.
Cotham Side, junction with St Matthew's Avenue	2m	Parking place reduced to facilitate turning movements.
Dove Street South	170m	Pay & Display only bays converted from permit holders only bays.
Fremantle Road, outside No 3	2m	Parking place reduced to facilitate access to gate.
Fremantle Square, adjacent to park, opposite 1-6	28m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only bays.
Fremantle Square, outside 26	12m	New permit holders' only bays to replace double yellow lines.
Fremantle Square, outside CLIC House	9.5m	Replace unrestricted space with double yellow lines.
Henrietta Street, opposite York Villa	7m	Permit holders only parking replaced by mandatory disabled bay.
High Kingsdown, adjacent to No 92	4 bays	End-on parking bays converted from permit holders only to shared use bays.
Highbury Villas	15m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only.
Highbury Villas, outside No 10	7m	Permit holders only parking replaced by mandatory disabled bay.
Hillgrove Street North	6m	New shared use bay to replace double yellow lines.
Kingsdown Parade, opposite Apsley Villas	15m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only.
Kingsdown Parade, opposite no 32	10m	Parking bays replaced by double yellow lines.
Kingsdown Parade,	5m	New permit holders' only bays to replace

outside 16		double yellow lines.
Kingsdown Parade, junction with Fremantle Road	3.6m	Parking bays reduced and replaced by double yellow lines to protect dropped kerb.
Kingsdown Parade, outside electrical sub station	6m	New permit holders' only bays to replace double yellow lines.
Kingsdown Parade / Clevedon Terrace		Implement new loading bay to facilitate access to the Kingsdown Vaults public house.
Myrtle Road, opposite No 11 / garage forecourt	14m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only.
Oxford Street	11.5m	Relocate parking bays to turning head.
Somerset Street, opposite Spring Hill	2 x 2m	Parking bays replaced by double yellow lines to facilitate access for emergency vehicles.
Portland Street, outside Kingsdown Sports Centre.	10m	New shared use bay to replace double yellow lines.
Southwell Street	2 x 5m	Additional Pay & Display only bays.
St Matthew's Road, outside 9-10	14m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only.
Thomas Street, outside No 12.	7m	Permit holders only parking replaced by mandatory disabled bay.
Thomas Street North	6m	New shared use bay to replace double yellow lines.
Victoria Walk, adjacent to No 9	24m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only.
Victoria Walk, approaching Cotham Brow	18m	Double yellow lines replaced by permit holders only bays.
Victoria Walk, junction with Victoria Gardens	5m	Parking bays replaced by double yellow lines to provide junction protection.
Victoria Walk, opposite 17-18	21.5m	Shared use bays converted from permit holders only.
West End, outside 1-3	40m	Extend double yellow lines into unrestricted space to protect access to 4-6 West End.

## Appendix C: Proposed operational changes to the Kingsdown RPS

Proposed change	Rationale
Add “confirmation that the vehicle is insured for business purposes” as an option to the business permit eligibility criteria.	Vehicles used for business purposes may not be registered in the name of the business, so will not be eligible for business permits unless this change is made.
Increase maximum stay in pay & display bays to three hours from two.	To better provide for attendance at courses in the area requiring a longer stay than two hours; and to enable more effective usage of visitors’ permits.
Enable owners of properties within the area to apply for a business permit.	To facilitate access to the property by owners who live outside the RPS area.
Enable owners of several properties within the area to apply for up to one business permit for every 10 properties that they own, up to a maximum of 10 permits.	To facilitate access for maintenance purposes etc by owners who live outside the RPS area.
Allow an additional 50 visitors’ permits per household costing £1 each to be issued during the year in instances where new residents have moved into the property during the year.	At present, if new residents move into a property which has used its allocation of 100 visitors’ permits, they would have to wait until the end of the year before they became eligible for visitors’ permits.
Allow residents of households with an individual address located on a private road but with no access to either a dedicated parking space or a communal space or spaces associated with that household to apply for the same permit allocation as other households without access to off-street parking.	This is intended to prevent a situation whereby a household could be left without any access to parking facilities of any kind.
Ensure that every property that has its main access via a road within the scheme area is included within the scheme.	This is to correct one anomaly at the scheme boundary.

## Appendix D: Proposed amendments to the Order

Road	TRO amendment proposed
Alfred Place	Reduce the permit parking bay outside number 4 by 3m; replace with double yellow lines.
Alfred Place	Reduce the permit parking bay outside 11a-17 by 7.5m; replace with double yellow lines.
Alfred Place	Move the disabled parking place by 2m south east.
Back of Kingsdown Parade	Show the double yellow line outside Fairlawn as terminating opposite the boundary between 85 and 87.
Clevedon Terrace	Amend the drawing to show that the double yellow lines outside number 2 stop at the edge of the build-out.
Cotham Brow	Reduce the double yellow line outside 57-63 by 18m.
Cotham Road	Remove double yellow lines shown around the island at the junction with St Michael's Hill and Hampton Road.
Cotham Road	Amend drawing to show the build out outside numbers 18 and 20.
Cotham Road	Amend the drawing to show that the double yellow line is continuous outside number 70.
Cotham Side	Reduce the shared use bay on the north eastern side of the road in front of the churchyard of St Matthew's Church by 1m; increase the double yellow line accordingly.
Dalton Square	The permit parking bay outside 4 Dalton Square should be reduced by 0.5m at the north eastern end and increased by 1m at the south western end.
Dove Street	Move the loading bay outside Fremantle House 6m south west.
Dove Street	Move the double yellow lines and disabled parking place opposite 8-12 by 5-6m north east.
Eugene Street	Remove the double yellow line shown across the access to the School of Nursing.
Fremantle Lane	Remove the double yellow lines from outside 43 and 51.
Fremantle Road	Remove the double yellow lines from outside 57 and extend the permit parking bay outside 37-55 by 4m.
Fremantle Road	Reduce the double yellow outside 2 Fremantle Square by 5m.
Henrietta Street	Reduce the permit parking bay outside Colston Fort by 3-4m; replace with double yellow lines.
High Kingsdown	Reduce the permit parking bay in front of 14 Oxford Street by 3m. Show double yellow line across the 3m stretch.
High Kingsdown	Amend drawing to show the correct position of the double yellow lines around the wheelchair ramp.
High Kingsdown	Move the permit parking bay behind the garages belonging to the block of flats 223 to 246 High

	Kingsdown by 1m north east.
<b>High Kingsdown</b>	Redraw the double yellow lines shown across the permit parking bay behind the garages belonging to the block of flats 223 to 246 High Kingsdown so that they stop on either side of the bay.
<b>Hillgrove Street</b>	Remove the double yellow lines from the access to Philips House car park.
<b>Jamaica Street</b>	Remove the shared use parking bay outside 4-8 from the drawing.
<b>Kingsdown Parade</b>	Remove the double yellow line outside 51-59 Kingsdown Parade from the drawing.
<b>Kingsdown Parade</b>	Reduce the permit parking bay outside 83-89 by 1-2m; replace with double yellow lines.
<b>Kingsdown Parade</b>	Move the disabled parking place outside 80 by 5m south west.
<b>Little Paul Street</b>	Remove the section of double yellow line that crosses the pavement and put in the section that follows the kerblin.
<b>Marlborough Hill Place</b>	Extend the permit parking bay outside 14-16 by 1m.
<b>Myrtle Road</b>	Remove the section of double yellow line that crosses the pavement and put in the section of double yellow line that follows the kerblin.
<b>Nugent Hill</b>	Reduce the disabled parking place outside number 3 by 2m; replace by extending permit parking bay.
<b>Somerset Street</b>	Remove disabled parking place shown outside 2-3 Somerset Street from the drawing and replace with permit parking bays.
<b>Somerset Street</b>	Amend the drawing to show that the double yellow line on the north western side of the road ends in line with the north eastern boundary of number 50.
<b>Somerset Street</b>	Show 6m of double yellow line outside 21-21a instead of continuous permit parking bays.
<b>Somerset Street</b>	Increase the permit parking bay outside 21-25 by 8.5m.
<b>Somerset Street</b>	Reduce the permit parking bay outside 29-41 by 9m at the north eastern end and 4m at the south western end.
<b>Somerset Street</b>	Reduce the permit parking bay outside 31-33 by 2m; replace with double yellow lines.
<b>St Matthew's Road</b>	Amend the drawing to add a permit parking bay outside 7-8.
<b>St Matthew's Road</b>	Remove the permit parking bay shown outside 3-4.
<b>St Michael's Hill</b>	Remove the double yellow lines shown around the island at the junction with Cotham Hill and Cotham Road.
<b>Thomas Street</b>	Parking bays outside 8-12 Thomas Street and 77 Stokes Croft to be shown as shared use bays rather than permit holders only.

<b>Tyndalls Park Mews</b>	Move the permit parking bay on the south eastern side of the road in front of numbers 3 and 4 by 1m south west.
<b>Victoria Walk</b>	Reduce the permit parking bay in front of the north eastern boundary of 1 Nugent Hill by 1m; replace by extending double yellow lines.
<b>Victoria Walk</b>	Increase the permit parking bay outside 1-4 by 1m; reduce double yellow lines accordingly.



**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL**  
**Equality Impact Assessment – Part One - Screening**

**Screening - Residents' Parking Scheme**

Part one of an EqIA – the screening – should be carried out at the planning and development stage of a policy, project, service, contract or strategy. This form should be used in conjunction with the guidance and as the first part of a full EqIA.

<b>Name of policy, project, service, contract or strategy being assessed</b>	Residents' Parking Scheme
<b>Directorate and Service</b>	City Development, Traffic Group
<b>Names and roles of officers completing the assessment</b>	Helen Minnery, Project Manager
<b>Main contact telephone number</b>	(0117) 903 6131
<b>Date</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> February 2010

## 1. Identify the aims of the policy, project, service, contract or strategy and how it is implemented

	<b>Key Questions</b>	Notes / Answers	<b>Any actions needed? By whom?</b>
1.1	Is this a new policy, project, service, contract or strategy or a review of an existing one?	Residents' Parking Scheme is a new strategy for prioritising parking in residential areas	
1.2	What is the main purpose of the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?	Its main purpose is to prioritise parking for residents, businesses, community facilities and their visitors. It is part of the overall transport policy, which aims to discourage commuters from parking in residential areas and encourage the use of alternative modes of transport.	
1.3	What are the main activities of the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?	To develop two pilot Residents' Parking Scheme areas in Cliftonwood and Kingsdown. To do this, permit holder parking bays and Pay & Display parking bays will be introduced in these areas, along with the required signs, lines and Pay & Display machines.	

1.4	Who are the main beneficiaries? Whose needs is it designed to meet?	Local residents in the pilot areas	
1.5	Which staff carry out the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?	Officers in Traffic and Parking will develop the scheme, taking advice from corporate communications and legal services as necessary.  Parking Services staff will administer and enforce the scheme once implemented.	
1.6	Are there areas of the policy or function that could be governed by an officer's judgement? eg. home visits "where appropriate". If so, is there guidance on how to exercise this to prevent any possible bias/prejudice creeping in?	Yes  Elements of the project / service rely on an officer's judgement, however key decisions are subject to members (Cabinet approval) and Department for Transport decisions.  Statutory (enforceable) disabled bays will be part of the scheme. There is currently an element of discretion used to approve applications for non-statutory bays. Best practice from elsewhere is being studied to define new eligibility criteria, which could remove discretion.	

1.7	<p>Is the Council working in Partnership with other organisations to implement this policy or function? Should this be taken into consideration? eg. Agree equalities monitoring categories Should the partnership arrangements have an EqIA?</p>	<p>The project does not involve any partnership arrangements.</p>	
1.8	<p>Taking the six strands of equalities, do you have any initial thoughts that any of the six equalities strands have particular needs relevant to the policy or function?</p> <p>Or is there anything in the policy, project, service, contract or strategy that you can think of at this stage that could discriminate or disadvantage any groups of people?</p> <p>Gender (include Transgender)</p> <p>Disability</p>	<p>No significant impact has been identified. The scheme has been designed to enable residents to park near to where they live much more easily than they can at present. This may make women in particular feel safer in their neighbourhood.</p> <p>The scheme will replace existing advisory disabled bays with statutory bays that are</p>	

	Age	<p>enforceable. This will improve access to them for disabled people and will have a resulting positive impact on their quality of life.</p> <p>The Disabled are more likely to require regular supportive / care visits; parking restrictions could potentially make this more difficult, which could have a negative impact on their quality of life. However, this has been mitigated by the decision to enable those in need of support / care visits to be provided with additional visitors' permits that their carers can use.</p> <p>Younger people are more likely to live in HMOs, either as students sharing a property or as unrelated young professionals renting a property. The scheme may have a greater negative impact on younger people than other people as it limits the number of permits that each household can apply for.</p> <p>Older people are more likely to require regular care visits; parking restrictions could potentially make this more difficult, which could have a negative impact on their quality of life. However, this has been mitigated by the decision to enable those in need of care visits to be provided with additional visitors'</p>	
--	-----	---	--

	<p>Race</p> <p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p>Faith / Belief</p> <p>Do any other specific groups have particular needs relevant to the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?</p>	<p>permits that their carers can use.</p> <p>No specific significant impact for Race has been identified.</p> <p>No specific significant impact for Sexual Orientation has been identified.</p> <p>No specific significant impact for Faith / Belief has been identified.</p> <p>No</p>	
1.9	<p>Did you use any data to inform your initial thoughts above? What data do you already have?</p>	<p>There is data available from a survey of 53,000 households seeking their views about residents' parking. An analysis of the response to the survey from people in the equalities strands found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no significant difference between the views of men and women regarding residents' parking.</li> <li>• Older age groups (50+) were more likely to support a residents' parking scheme in</li> </ul>	

		<p>their street than all respondents overall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People from all disabled groups were more likely to support a residents' parking scheme in their street than non-disabled people and all respondents as a whole.</li> <li>• Christian and Muslim respondents were more likely to support a residents' parking scheme than respondents overall – although the sample size of some religious groups in the survey was too small to draw conclusions about the population overall.</li> </ul>	
1.10	<p>Are there gaps in the data that require you to do further work? What are these gaps?</p>	<p>As no significant impacts have been identified and the responses to the 2008 survey found that the equalities groups were more likely to be supportive of residents' parking than respondents overall, it is concluded that no further work is necessary at this stage.</p>	

If the result of the screening process is that there is the potential for a significant impact on any equality group or if any equality group has significantly different needs, then a full equality impact assessment must be carried out. If you are unsure please seek advice from a directorate or corporate equalities officer.

Signed:

Signed:

Service Manager: Highways and Traffic

Directorate Equalities Adviser:

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> July 2011

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> July 2011

**Additional comments / recommendations**

The draft screening Equalities Impact Assessment for the Residents' Parking Scheme has been completed and has not identified any adverse impacts that have not been mitigated against, due to this it has been signed off at this stage as it is being presented to Cabinet in July 2011.

**Recommendation**

Although there has been some equalities stakeholder / resident involvement previously through a consultation process further equalities work with stakeholders may need to be progressed as the project moves forward and considers further areas where the scheme could be implemented. The outcome of this work will help determine whether or not a full equalities impact assessment will need to be completed.

The signing of this screening form has been agreed on the basis of the above recommendation.