

### Appx 3: Summary of objections/concerns to the parking proposals from the Public Notice with a response from the Traffic Management team

Objection and concern	Traffic Management Response
<p>1. We believe the survey misrepresented the situation, we understood it was fact finding rather than a decision making one</p>	<p>The results of the EBRA survey were viewed by the Traffic Management team as an indication of a high level of support from residents in Chetwynd Drive for Permit Parking restrictions. The decision making process is however through the formal public notice and legal consultation associated with the Councils' subsequent proposals for permit parking restrictions.</p>
<p>2. The issue is over student car parking, therefore as residents and tax payers why should we have to resolve an issue which squarely lies with the University as the cars belong to the students who are paying for their University residency. There are car parking spaces available within the University's grounds such as in the Halls in Glen Eyre Road which have been empty for several months. Therefore the University needs to take responsibility for their students and their cars if they wish to maintain good relationship with their neighbours</p>	<p>The Council works with the University to promote use of the Uni-Link bus service (to which all first year students must subscribe). Whilst we very much welcome students to Southampton to study, we would prefer that they did not bring vehicles, which otherwise will add to congestion, carbon emissions and parking issues across the city. As the designated Highway Authority we however have no powers over the students or the University in respect of the use of parking off the public highway. Otherwise any powers within the Council could only be applied under planning consents for new developments. The University also have no powers to restrict use of the public highway and are entitled to adopt a commercial approach to the use of their parking facilities.</p>
<p>3. The University receives financial reward from students living within the Halls of Residence and therefore has an obligation to provide sufficient parking facilities within its boundaries. It is common planning and Good Practice (is it not?) to ensure that residents have adequate parking facilities within all residential developments nationwide.</p>	<p>Since Planning Policy Guidance 13 Transport was introduced by the Department of Communities and Local Government 2001, new maximum (rather than minimum) parking standards were introduced for new developments. The following extract highlights the objectives for this:- <i>The availability of car parking has a major influence on the means of transport people choose for their journeys. Some studies suggest that levels of parking can be more significant than levels of public transport provision in determining means of travel (particularly for the journey to work) even for locations very well served by public transport. Car parking also takes up a large amount of space in development, is costly to business and reduces densities. Reducing the amount of parking in new development (and in the expansion and change of use in existing development) is essential, as part of a package of planning and transport measures, to promote sustainable travel choices.</i></p> <p><i>(<a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/ppg13">http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/ppg13</a>)</i></p> <p>Any new developments would therefore be subject to restrictions on parking provision. For example for higher education establishment the maximum parking provision is 1 space for every 2 members of staff and 1 space for every 15 students. In this context the Council policy is to support requests from communities for permit parking restrictions as a means of reducing the impact of this policy on neighbouring roads.</p>
<p>4. The permits are initially free but subject to review and within the current economic climate we are likely to end up paying for the privilege of parking in front of our homes. Can you guarantee this will not happen?</p>	<p>Since initial briefing letter, the Cabinet of the Council agreed prospective measures to address budget shortfalls for 2010/11. These include proposing to introduce charging for Visitor Permits. This was given an annualised value of £85-90K. Otherwise the current Administration's policy is to retain the free charge for first permits. As a consequence within Zone 9 there are relatively few properties that pay the charge for a second permit, due to the relatively high level of off-street parking available. It is not however possible to guarantee that charges may not be applied at any time in the future.</p>

### Appx 3: Summary of objections/concerns to the parking proposals from the Public Notice with a response from the Traffic Management team

<p>5. Eastleigh Borough Council is reviewing its permit charges (see below)  <i>It is recommended that the cost of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> residential permits, professional carers permits and business permits are increased from 19 October as detailed in Appendix A, to further reduce this deficit. It is also recommended that consideration is given to the introduction of a new charge of £30 for the first permit to all new entrants to the scheme including who move within the scheme</i>          The appendix referred to indicates a 20% rise in permit fees, the last increase came into force in October 2009! Can we expect similar increases in just under twelve months? Our experience shows that Councils throughout the Country irrespective of their political bias, tend to adopt very similar approaches to income generation, we fear this will be the case with Chetwynd Drive</p>	<p>As highlighted above the City Council have reviewed the budget for 2010/11 and are intending to propose to introduce charges for visitor permits. Otherwise whilst there are different charging regimes for permit parking across the country, the charging regime for permits in Southampton have been relatively stable. Clearly there are financial pressures on the Council, but the policy is where possible to make savings in the cost of service as opposed to the level of service. Full details of the budgetary review by Southampton City Council can however be viewed at the following web addresses          Report: <a href="http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=2628">http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=2628</a>          Appendices: <a href="http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=2632">http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=2632</a>          Decision: <a href="http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=2841">http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=2841</a></p>
<p>6. In times of cutbacks and as taxpayer I think this is a waste of resources, signs, then management of the permit system, policing, maintenance and having new posts erected Taxpayers cannot afford this.</p>	<p>It is Council policy to propose resident parking schemes where requested and supported by a community. In this case the Traffic Management took into account representations from residents and EBRA, together with the consideration that the design work had already been completed following previous concerns from residents in 2007. Budget was therefore allocated subject to the current public consultation process. The initial cost if approved would be around £5K, with significantly lower running costs.</p>
<p>7. Policing. My concern is that if we fail to display our permit we are the ones that will get punished, yet we are not the cause of the problem</p>	<p>If residents wish to have a permit parking scheme introduced to restrict non-resident parking, then displaying a permit is the only current means we have of differentiating between parked vehicles. Our Parking Services are looking at alternative technologies (e.g. automatic number plate recognition), but residents should take into account the risk of incurring a penalty charge for not displaying a permit.</p>
<p>8. We regularly use any available company vehicle to commute between our home and business premises. Our understanding is that Residents parking permits are allocated on a Specified Vehicle basis, if this indeed the case we would have to personally apply and pay for approximately 25 permits at an annual cost of £1500. This is preposterous, £1500 to park outside our own home.</p>	<p>There is a limit of 2 permits per household (3 in exceptional circumstances) and therefore it is not possible to allocate 25 permits to an individual household. Whilst company vehicles are catered for within the scheme provided they are not over 3.5 tonnes, there is no facility for registering permits against more than one vehicle. Permits can be changed with a change of vehicle but this would be impractical on a daily basis. Unfortunately this is an area wide scheme designed to serve typical family vehicle use and where in most cases off-road parking can accommodate occasional vehicle use.</p>
<p>9. We engage the services of several domestic service providers: the frequency of their combined visits amounts on average to three per week. The proposed permit Scheme allows for 60 (day) visitor permits per year which based on our circumstances is quite clearly insufficient. The financial implications for us as a family are horrendous and the proposed Scheme if successful, will quite clearly have a dramatic effect on our quality of life. It simply cannot go ahead.</p>	<p>Visitors permits are restricted across all the permit parking schemes to help manage the level of on-street parking and reduce the risk of re-circulation of these permits for financial gain. It is possible that as part of any prospective proposal to introduce charging for visitor permits that the allowance may be increased. However no details are currently available for this. From our experience in Zone 9 residents tend to address this need by making use of their off-street parking, if visitor needs cannot be covered by the allocation of visitor permits. Residents should however take this into account in either sustaining or registering an objection to the scheme.</p>

### Appx 3: Summary of objections/concerns to the parking proposals from the Public Notice with a response from the Traffic Management team

<p>10. We often have family relatives staying with us; they are retired and rely upon us to care for them in our home on a regular basis (they do not hold Blue Badges). They are now expected we assume to pay for that privilege because they will require a permit to park their cars. Will this not discourage them from seeking the assistance they quite clearly require? It is obvious that no thought has been given to the proposal other than the obvious financial benefits for the Council.</p>	<p>Whilst there Essential Visitors Permits for residents dependent on carers, these do not apply for visiting relatives. Any provision for on-street visitor parking has to be met through the allocation of visitors permits. The scheme around the University operates on an area wide basis and it is not possible to customise permit arrangements to meet the needs of individual household needs. Residents should therefore again take this into account in either sustaining or registering an objection to the scheme. There is no financial benefit for the Council introducing the scheme.</p>
<p>11. There can be no justification in such Council expenditure to combat an issue which only occurs for part of the year; University term times equate to 208 days per annum, outside of this there are no problems whatsoever with parking. It appears however that the Council has no qualms in asking us the residents to contribute to a scheme which will be in force throughout the entire year. Based on this information, it is obvious that for 43% of the year there is no requirement for enforcement, however the fees proposed are for year round patrols. Yet another complete waste of taxpayers resources by Southampton City Council</p>	<p>Restrictions in Zone 9 generally operate all year reflecting issues with staff, general commuter and student parking. In The Parkway however the schemes operates from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> May. The signing requirement restricts any further variation. In order to assess residents views on this option please complete the attached survey. There are however no changes to the permit charges as the installation and administration costs are unchanged. Enforcement costs are spread across the city and relate to levels of compliance. The high level of support for the existing permit parking schemes and requests we receive to extend operation of the schemes would indicate that most residents value this service.</p>
<p>12. What alternatives have been considered? Do the University Halls issue letters to new students warning them not to encroach on local residents? Do these letters specifically refer to parking in neighbouring residential streets? Is there a warning that any complaints received may lead to severe sanctions? Why does the University not implement a specific Residents Complaint procedure, whereby we can record vehicle index numbers ourselves and report directly to the University? Have any of these avenues been explored. We doubt it very much! It is far simpler to put the burden on the residents; generate income rather than confrontation or at least dialogue with one of City's largest and influential institutions. We are not prepared for you to take "the easy way out", especially when we are expected to pay for it.</p>	<p>These points would be better addressed to the University or the East Bassett Residents' Association who will have discussed student parking in the area. Whilst the Traffic Management team have met with the University Transport Manager, as highlighted above as a Highway Authority we have no powers over how the University relates to its staff or students.</p> <p>Otherwise again there is no revenue gain for the introduction of permit parking by the Council.</p>
<p>13. I reluctantly have to agree, in part, to the solution you have put forward. My only proviso would be that double yellow line should be put opposite 12, 14, and 16. The experience of late has been thoughtlessness parking of cars on both sides of the road which has, on occasion, meant the service and delivery vehicles have not been able to get down the road. One day this might be an emergency vehicles such as an ambulance or fire engine. Sometimes students have partly parked on the pavement opposite making it necessary for the elderly folk at the bottom of the drive to walk in the road. Last term I had a student parking his car right outside of my house, on this side of the road for seven weeks making it difficult for my daughter to visit. Therefore, I reluctantly concede to the triumph of experience over hope and agree to your plan, provided that my health and safety concerns are addressed.</p>	<p>There are no current plans to add further No Waiting at Any Time restrictions as part of these proposals. If there is a requirement to restrict parking to maintain access, we would need to apply no waiting at any time restrictions to one side of the road throughout Chetwynd Drive. From our experience of previous schemes, the requirement for permits has been sufficient to deter university-related parking. This then allows residents to manage their own parking which we understand is the generally preferred option.</p>

**Appx 3: Summary of objections/concerns to the parking proposals from the Public Notice with a response from the Traffic Management team**

<p>14. If the Council insists on implementing the Permit Scheme the erection of additional poles and increased signage will be detrimental to the ambience of the Drive. It will affect our enjoyment of the locality, adversely affect the 'street scene' with additional furniture and there will be a significant detrimental impact on the value of our home.</p>	<p>These schemes are only introduced at the request and support of the community. The scheme is however dependent on signing that complies with Department for Transport standards. Residents can view these along The Parkway, Tower Gardens or in Butterfield Road. The valuation of properties is outside of the scope of this process.</p>
---	--

NB: Duplicate concerns or objections have not been stated.