

**Cabinet Highways Report**

---

**Report of:** Executive Director, Place

---

**Report to:** Cabinet Member for Business, Skills & Development

---

**Date:** 13<sup>th</sup> November, 2014

---

**Subject:** Petition -Request for further consultation with respect to a proposed pay & display parking scheme on Ecclesall Road at Banner Cross.

---

**Author of Report:** Nat Porter (t 35031)

---

**Key Decision:** NO

---

**Summary:** The report provides an update on investigations subsequent to the decision of 12<sup>th</sup> June '14 regarding a petition received concerning the proposed pay & display parking scheme on Ecclesall Road at Banner Cross district centre, and seeks a decision on the petition and the scheme.

---

**Reasons for Recommendations:**

- The scheme is neutral in terms of the Council's statutory duties, and is considered to be discretionary;
- The scheme is neither expected nor intended to contribute (or impinge on) to the Council's statutory duties. The scheme is considered to be a discretionary matter that was initially promoted at the request of Ward Councillors. The Ward Councillors have, in light of the petitions received objecting to the proposals, withdrawn their support for the scheme;
- There appears to be an irreconcilable conflict between the wishes of traders and those of nearby residents, and there is no statutory or technical reason that would suggest implementing the scheme be more advantageous than not implementing it, or vice versa; and,

- Budgetary pressures are such that capital expenditure cannot be justified on a discretionary scheme, where there is not a consensus amongst local people in support of the proposals.
- 

**Recommendations:**

- That no further work is progressed with respect of this scheme; and,
  - That the petitioners and those consulted in March 2014 be informed of their decision accordingly.
- 

**Background Papers:** Appendix A – plot of locations of signatories of received petitions  
Appendix B – consultation response and petition signatories amongst traders on Ecclesall Road  
Appendix C – report on consultation provided by Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group

---

**Category of Report:**        **OPEN**

---

## Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

<b>Financial Implications</b>
YES Cleared by: G. Saxton (23 Sep '14)
<b>Legal Implications</b>
YES Cleared by: N. Wynter (18 Sep '14)
<b>Equality of Opportunity Implications</b>
NO Cleared by: A. Johnston (17 Sep '14)
<b>Tackling Health Inequalities Implications</b>
NO
<b>Human Rights Implications</b>
NO
<b>Environmental and Sustainability implications</b>
NO
<b>Economic Impact</b>
NO
<b>Community Safety Implications</b>
NO
<b>Human Resources Implications</b>
NO
<b>Property Implications</b>
NO
<b>Area(s) Affected</b>
Ecclesall Ward
<b>Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Lead</b>
Cllr. Leigh Bramall
<b>Relevant Scrutiny Committee</b>
Economic and Environmental Wellbeing
<b>Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?</b>
NO
<b>Press Release</b>
NO

## **REPORT TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS, SKILLS & DEVELOPMENT**

### **PETITION -REQUEST FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED PAY & DISPLAY PARKING SCHEME ON ECCLESALL ROAD AT BANNER CROSS.**

#### **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The report provides an update on investigations subsequent to the decision of 12<sup>th</sup> June '14 regarding a petition received concerning the proposed pay & display parking scheme on Ecclesall Road at Banner Cross district centre, and seeks a decision on the petition and the scheme.
- 1.2 The report sets out the findings of investigations subsequent to the decision of 12<sup>th</sup> June '14, and makes recommendations accordingly.

#### **2.0 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD PEOPLE**

- 2.1 Managing kerbside parking in district shopping centres to protect access for customers contributes to '*A Strong and Competitive Economy*'.

#### **3.0 OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY**

- 3.1
  - Ensure that the proposed parking scheme achieves the objective of improving customer access to shops in the Banner Cross district centre.
  - Minimise any negative impacts of the parking scheme as far as possible whilst achieving the above objective.

#### **4.0 MAIN BODY OF THE REPORT**

##### ***Background***

- 4.1 A petition signed by 47 parties in the Banner Cross area was received in April 2014, requesting that proposals for a pay & display parking scheme on Ecclesall Road at Banner Cross are deferred until further consultation has taken place.
- 4.2 The proposed pay & display parking scheme was progressed at the request of Ecclesall Ward Councillors, who raised concerns that long-stay parking on Ecclesall Road was hindering access to local retailers for customers, which in turn was harming the viability of those businesses.
- 4.3 This petition was reported to the Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session on 12th June 2014. It was decided at that meeting that a decision on the scheme be deferred, pending further investigations, and that the outcome of those investigations be reported to a subsequent meeting. This report outlines the findings of those further investigations.

4.4 In addition, further three further documents were produced by the original petitioner in June 2014, containing a total 190 signatures against the proposed scheme (including duplicates across all four petitions). These were received prior to the Decision Session but after the publication of the previous report, and so were not referred to in the text of that report; Members were instead advised of the receipt of these documents verbally.

4.5 The scheme is neither expected nor intended to contribute to (or impinge on) the Council's statutory duties. The scheme is considered to be a discretionary matter that was initially promoted at the request of Ward Councillors.

***Summary of findings of investigations pre-June 2014***

4.6 Parking surveys were conducted in October 2013, during the early stages of the development of the scheme. These indicated that -

- On weekdays, parking demand on the relevant part of Ecclesall Road exceeded 85% at periods, and that around 10-15% of the available parking capacity is occupied by vehicles staying longer than 4 hours ;
- On Saturdays, parking demand on the relevant part of Ecclesall Road exceeded 85% for most of the morning, and was full to capacity at periods. Around 25-50% of the available parking capacity is occupied by vehicles staying longer than 4 hours.

4.7 The survey suggested that Ward Members' concerns that long-staying may cause a hindrance to visitors wishing to park, in that –

- On weekdays, parking capacity was at times full to the point that finding a space becomes difficult, though not impossible;
- On Saturday, parking capacity was full to the point that finding a space becomes difficult for significant periods, and is on occasion not possible; and,
- Introducing parking controls improve the availability of kerbside parking for visitors, by removing vehicles associated with long-stay parking.

4.8 Frontagers of the part of Ecclesall Road under study were consulted on a potential time-limited pay & display parking scheme in March 2014. The purpose of the consultation was to establish whether local businesses agreed with Ward Councillors that pay & display parking would improve trading conditions, and to establish appropriate time limits and extents for any scheme. This found –

- 56% of responding businesses were in support (with 32% against);
- 52% of businesses agreed or strongly agreed the proposals would improve trade (28% disagreed);
- All responding residents were against the proposals;
- Of all respondents, 40% were in support of the proposals, with 51% against.

- 4.9 It was found there was greater support for the proposals from frontagers south / uphill of Huntingtower Road. On this part of the street specifically-
- 70% of responding businesses were in support (with 20% against);
  - 65% of businesses agreed or strongly agreed the proposals would improve trade (20% disagreed);
  - All responding residents were against the proposals; Of all respondents, 58% were in support of the proposals, with 38% against.
- 4.10 On the basis of the consultation results and the parking surveys, it was judged that a pay & display scheme would improve the availability of kerbside parking for customers of local shops, and that this would improve trading conditions.
- 4.11 On account of the relative lack of support for the scheme north of Huntingtower Road, it was intended that any scheme progressed would be reduced in extents by approximately one third, so as to minimise additional restrictions south of Huntingtower Road whilst providing sufficient short-stay capacity to cater for demand observed in the October 2013 surveys.
- 4.12 The projected impact of the revised scheme would be to displace long-staying vehicles from the part of Ecclesall Road to be regulated, so as to provide kerbside parking capacity for short-staying visitors. Projections indicated that the remaining part of Ecclesall Road would be able to accommodate this displacement on weekdays. On Saturday mornings, approximately 7-13 vehicles would be displaced outside of the study area (either further down Ecclesall Road, or into adjacent side streets).
- 4.13 A public meeting was held at Banner Cross Methodist Hall on the evening of 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2014. A verbal update on the outcomes of this meeting was provided at the meeting of June 12<sup>th</sup>; in summary, the key points raised were:
- Concerns were raised about potential displacement into residential side streets;
  - Concerns were raised about existing parking problems in residential side streets; and,
  - Residents felt they should have been subject to more consultation and/or inclusion in a wider scheme to address parking issues in the side streets.

***Further analysis of petitions received in spring 2014***

- 4.14 So as to identify the nature of local objections to the proposals, the locations of the signatories to the various petitions were plotted on a map of the area, included as Appendix A to this report.

- 4.15 The number of points plotted is less than the number of signatories to the petitions. This is due to -
- Multiple signatories giving a single address;
  - Some signatories giving an address outside the extents of the plan; and,
  - Some signatories not providing adequate information to determine their location.
- 4.16 As can be seen from Appendix A, the vast majority of people signing the petition against the proposed scheme live in residential premises to the west of Ecclesall Road.
- 4.17 In the area shown in Appendix A, representatives from 58 premises signed one or more of the petitions received against the proposed scheme. By way of comparison, there are approximately 662 households in the vicinity (the figure is the 2011 Census finding for the Sheffield 047D Lower Layer Super Output Area). Signatories to the petitions against the proposals therefore account for approximately 9% of nearby households.
- 4.18 Signatures given by traders on Ecclesall Road were also analysed in this manner, and compared against responses from the March 2014 consultation. This analysis is shown in Appendix B. Only 6 businesses signed one or more of the petitions. This is fewer than the eight businesses that indicated they did not support the proposals when consulted by the Council in March.
- 4.19 Two of the signing businesses included comments suggesting they were not necessarily against pay & display parking per se (one suggesting a free period of 30 minutes as opposed to 15 proposed, one indicating they supported a short section of pay & display parking, as well as uncharged 30 minute bays and changes to bus lanes).
- 4.20 This analysis of signatures does not support the assertion made by the petitioner at the meeting of June 12<sup>th</sup> that the majority of local businesses are against the proposals.

***Results of consultation conducted by Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group***

- 4.21 The Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group conducted their own survey of traders in June 2014. A representative of the Group spoke with managers (where available) to sought their view, positive or negative, on the proposed scheme. An update was provided in September 2014, with an indication of the view of a trader established after June 2014.
- 4.22 This found 71% of responding businesses were in support (with 20% against). The businesses that indicated support amounted to 60% of all occupied shops on the part of Ecclesall Road under consideration. The information provided by the Neighbourhood Group is included in full in Appendix C.

4.23 The findings of the Neighbourhood Group's survey are broadly consistent with the findings of the March 2014 Council consultation, in that they indicate there is significant support amongst local traders for the proposed scheme.

***Analysis of parking issues in residential side streets***

4.24 A concern raised by the petitioners, and at the public meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> June, is that kerbside parking congestion in residential side streets would become worse as a consequence of the proposed scheme on Ecclesall Road.

4.25 Projections of displacement suggest that no additional vehicles are likely to be displaced into these streets on weekdays, and no more than 15 vehicles would be expected to be displaced in the worst periods on Saturdays.

4.26 National Census data indicates in Lower Super Output Area Sheffield 047D (approximately bounded by Ecclesall Road, Gisborne Road, Greystones Road and Onslow Road), residents keep 760 cars or vans in the area.

4.27 An initial measurement of streets in the area suggests there is space for approximately 524 cars to be kept on street lawfully (excluding Ecclesall Road itself, on the grounds that parking is not available at all times of day). This is sufficient to accommodate only two-thirds of the demand from local residents.

4.28 The above analysis is very approximate, in that it does not account for many factors such as the use of off-street parking, for vehicles kept by residents but outside of the area, or the loss of capacity at driveways etc. Further work would be required to gain a more complete understanding of the parking situation in the area. However, given the apparent lack of off-street parking in the area, it would appear that it is likely there is a significant issue with residents attempting to keep more vehicles on street than there is space to satisfactorily accommodate.

4.29 Therefore, to tackle parking problems in the residential side streets would likely require the Council to act so as to actively ration kerbside parking and deter local residents from keeping vehicles on street. There is no budget, programme or policy that would allow this at present, and such an approach would likely be highly contentious, particularly amongst local residents.



4.30 The implications of the initial analysis into parking pressure in the residential side streets for the Ecclesall Road scheme can be summarised thus –

- Parking is likely to be under severe pressure as a consequence of excessive demand from residents, notwithstanding any additional demands that may exist;
- The proposed scheme is not expected to result in significant displacement of vehicles into adjacent streets. However, the displacement that would occur could be expected to result in a marginal worsening of kerbside parking congestion. This might be considered relatively insignificant compared against the issues around excessive residential demand; and,
- The Council has no budget or policy to introduce measures that would effectively mitigate against excessive parking demand in the residential side streets.

***Consultation with Ward Councillors***

4.31 The pay & display parking scheme was initially proposed at the request of Ward Councillors (see paragraph 4.2).

4.32 Subsequent to the receipt of petitions, and the additional investigations outlined in this report, Ward Councillors have withdrawn their support for the proposed pay & display parking scheme, and now wish that it is not progressed

***Financial implications***

4.33 Owing to budgetary pressures, if the scheme were to be progressed, it would be necessary to review funding across the Local Transport Plan (LTP) programme and identify reductions in other LTP schemes to fund the cost of these works. This review would be subject to the standard capital approvals process.

***Legal implications***

- 4.34 The Council in exercising its functions under the Road Traffic Regulation Act is required under the Section 122 of the Act to (a) secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians) and (b) the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway, and so far as practicable having regard to the matters listed below.

The matters to be considered before reaching any decision are:

- i) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
- ii) the effect on the amenities of a locality and (including) the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles;
- iii) the national air quality strategy prepared under Section 80 of the Environment Act 1995;
- iv) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of passengers/potential passengers; and
- v) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

***Equality of Opportunity implications***

- 4.35 No significant equalities implications have been identified in connection with either progressing the proposed scheme, or with retaining the status quo. Any pay & display scheme would include exemptions for disabled persons' blue badge holders, from both charges and time limits.

**5.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 Several options have been considered, including some suggested by the petitioners.

- 5.2 Providing uncharged limited waiting was considered, but is not recommended for the following reasons:
- Parking charges cover the ongoing cost of enforcing the parking restrictions;
  - Uncharged limited waiting requires the Council's enforcement officers to visit the site twice; whereas where ticket machines are in operation officers only need to visit once as they can determine time of arrival from the information on the ticket. This makes uncharged limited waiting much more expensive to enforce than pay & display, even before the income generated from charges is considered;
  - If the Council cannot make regular enforcement cost-effective, it will only be able to enforce the restrictions relatively infrequently. This risks non-compliance, undermining the objectives of the scheme. Experience at Woodseats suggests this risk is significant where uncharged limited waiting is in place at that location, local traders have raised concerns about abuse of restrictions;
  - If compliance were good, providing free time-limited waiting would not be expected to address the petitioners' concerns regarding displacement –
    - The time limit would still require long-staying vehicles to find somewhere else to park. Given the difficulty in parking in adjacent side streets and the low charges proposed, it is not considered that keeping parking free would result in significantly less displacement;
    - This amount of vehicles displaced would be greatly increased if the time limit were as short as 30 minutes, as the petitioners suggest.

- 5.3 Introducing tidal bus lanes (where the inbound bus lane operated only in the morning and the outbound lane only in the evening) was also considered. This is not recommended for the following reasons :–
- Tidal bus lanes would encourage additional movements across the carriageway where drivers wish to access the side on which parking is permitted. These movements may have road safety and traffic congestion implications that are not presently understood by the Council. (A trial scheme is underway on Chesterfield Road to gain a better understanding of these);
  - The scheme is being funded as part of a wider scheme to improve bus journey times and reliability on the Ecclesall Road corridor. It would not be possible to use this funding on measures that could be expected to worsen bus journey times and reliability (even if only slightly); and,
  - It is acknowledged that the introduction of tidal flow bus lanes would be advantageous to traders in that it would provide some parking capacity at all times of day. However they would also make it easier for drivers to leave their vehicles for long periods. In particular, local residents would be able to park their car on one side of the street, and move to the other side at lunch time. It is expected, particularly given parking pressures in adjacent residential areas, that allowing this possibility would increase the demand for long-stay parking on Ecclesall Road, reducing the available space for short-staying visitors to local shops. Parking controls would therefore be more necessary to protect parking for visitors to shops if tidal flow bus lanes were introduced than now (i.e. to assist traders, tidal flow bus lanes would need to be introduced as well as pay & display parking, not instead of parking controls).

- 5.4 Introduction of a wider parking scheme was considered. Such a scheme might include measures in side streets to manage parking demand to improve the availability of parking for local residents as well as pay & display parking to protect parking for visitors to and customers of shops on Ecclesall Road. This option is not recommended because :-
- The scheme budget is insufficient to cover the additional costs of a wider scheme;
  - The Council's current policy for the introduction of permit parking schemes does not allow for introduction of a permit parking scheme in this location as a higher priority than completing schemes in the proposed peripheral parking zones around the city centre (although this could be changed); and,
  - Initial analysis of census data indicates there is likely to be a significant problem of excessive residential demand for parking. To be effective in improving the parking situation, parking controls would therefore need to actively restrict residents' ability to park on street; whether this be through the use of punitive charges for permits, and/or through a system of issuing a fixed number of permits with waiting lists once all permits are issued.

A permit parking scheme that actively restricts residents' ability to keep cars on streets is not allowed for by Sheffield's current permit parking policy. To give an indication of how strict such controls would need to be, initial analysis indicates that such a scheme would need to allow fewer than 0.7 cars per household to be parked on street (allowing some headroom for visitors etc.) As of the 2011 census, there are 1.1 cars per household in the area (including vehicles kept off street; expected to be few in number owing to the lack of off-street parking in the area).

Such a draconian cut in the numbers of cars the Council is prepared to allow residents to keep on street would likely be hugely unpopular with local residents.

## **6.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 The scheme is neutral in terms of the Council's statutory duties, and is considered to be discretionary;
- 6.2 The scheme is neither expected nor intended to contribute (or impinge on) to the Council's statutory duties. The scheme is considered to be a discretionary matter that was initially promoted at the request of Ward Councillors. The Ward Councillors have, in light of the petitions received objecting to the proposals, withdrawn their support for the scheme and now wish the scheme not be progressed;
- 6.3 There appears to be an irreconcilable conflict between the wishes of traders and those of nearby residents, and there is no statutory or technical reason that would suggest implementing the scheme be more advantageous than not implementing it, or vice versa; and,

6.4 Budgetary pressures are such that capital expenditure cannot be justified on a discretionary scheme, where there is not a consensus amongst local people in support of the proposals.

## **7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 That no further work is progressed with respect of this scheme; and,

7.2 That the petitioners and those consulted in March 2014 be informed of their decision accordingly.

Nat Porter  
Senior Transport Planner  
23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2014