

CABINET

14 SEPTEMBER 2011

REVIEW OF THE RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME - RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

REPORT OF HEAD OF ACCESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Contact Officers: Dan Massey & Andy Hickman Tel No: 01962 848534/105

Email: dmassey@winchester.gov.uk / ahickman@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

[CAB2139](#) Review of the Residents' Parking Scheme – Preliminary Results from Public Consultation – 16 March 2011

[CAB 2083\(TP\)](#) Review of the Residents' Parking Scheme – 1 December 2010

[CAB 1975 \(TP\)](#) Winchester City (Off-Street) Parking Places Order – Resident Concessions – 22 February 2010

[CAB 1914 \(TP\)](#) Winchester Residents' Off-street Permit Scheme – 5 Nov 2009

[CAB 1800\(TP\)](#) Consideration of Residents' Season Ticket Holder's Discount – 10 February 2009

[CAB 1751 \(TP\)](#) Winchester Residents' Parking Scheme Review – 17 Nov 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Following approval of CAB2083(TP), officers carried out a public consultation exercise to establish the level of support and to seek comments on a number of potential measures to alter the operation and control of the Winchester's Residents' Parking Scheme. A first report on the findings in relation to visitor permits was agreed by Cabinet in March 2011 and this report presents the remainder of the results of the public consultation and suggests possible ways in which to take the review forward.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That Cabinet notes the results of the public consultation and the new procedures in place to deal with abuse of 'visitor' permits.
2. That no further action be taken to progress 'Proposals 6, 7 & 8' (as outlined in the Report) at this time.
3. That in order to address some of the capacity issues within the 'Inner Zones', officers review the available spaces and capacity with a view to accommodating additional on-street parking spaces, with the first phase to include the creation of an additional 15 spaces in Park Avenue for dual use by zones M & D.
4. That Cabinet notes the progress being made with the consultation and creation of additional controlled parking zones in Winchester.
5. That as part of the annual review of car parking charges, consideration is given to the creation of discounted residents' season tickets for off-street car parks in relation to the areas of the Town where on-street parking is particularly constrained.
6. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure (in consultation with the relevant ward Councillor) be authorised to progress traffic regulation orders to provide additional on-street parking spaces as set out in 3. above.
7. That where required for the above recommendations, the Head of Legal Services be authorised to give public notice of the necessary orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) required to give effect to these changes and (if no responses are received within the statutory consultation period) to make such orders for implementation.
8. If relevant responses to the proposals are received within the statutory consultation period, that a further report be taken to a Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee to consider such responses.

CABINET

14 SEPTEMBER 2011

REVIEW OF THE RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME - RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

REPORT OF HEAD OF ACCESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

DETAIL:

1 Introduction & Background

- 1.1 In December 2010, Report [CAB 2083\(TP\)](#) reviewed the operation and control of Winchester's Residents' Parking Scheme. It recommended a number of possible changes to the scheme with a view to improving the service provided to the residents of Winchester. Following approval of CAB2083(TP), officers arranged for a public consultation on a package of 'Key' and 'Further' proposals.
- 1.2 The 'Key' proposals were centred on the notion that the use of 'visitor' permits be phased out and be replaced by the use of 'scratchcards'. This proposal came about because of the potential for abuse from this form of permit. However, due to high level of concern expressed over the proposals in relation to visitor permits and the high number of residents voting against it, it was felt that this matter should be dealt with in advance of consideration of other possible changes to the residents' parking scheme, to remove uncertainty and to allay concerns of residents. This resulted in an early report to Cabinet ([CAB2139](#)) which presented the preliminary results from the public consultation, and in view of the lack of support for the proposals Cabinet agreed that the 'Key Proposals' relating to changes to visitor permit arrangements should not be progressed.
- 1.3 As a result of the consultation, which identified the need for better monitoring and enforcement of the use of 'visitor' permits, new procedures have now been implemented to more effectively deal with reports of alleged abuse. A database has been established to record all possible cases of permit abuse, as part of a new procedure under which letters are sent to the registered permit holders in such cases, and if no satisfactory explanation is forthcoming then permits can be cancelled and future entitlements withdrawn. Subsequent enforcement action can then be taken through the issuing of Penalty Charge Notices in relation to cancelled permits. Such action is now possible as the Traffic Regulation Order has been amended to allow for the removal of permits in cases where their misuse can be determined. The first such letters were sent out in early June and the cases are now being progressed.
- 1.4 Having considered report CAB 2139, Cabinet also agreed that further analysis be carried out of the consultation results and comments in relation to the other possible changes to the scheme (as consulted upon) and that this be reported to Cabinet in due course. All of the results of the consultation have now been collated and analysed and this report sets out the results and proposes a way forward.

2 Consultation, Results & Discussion

- 2.1 A letter and questionnaire was sent to 4,083 households which have some form of parking permit as part of the Residents' Parking scheme. Residents were invited to respond to the consultation either by the return of the completed questionnaire or by filling in the survey 'on-line'. The consultation period lasted four weeks and 1865 residents responded.
- 2.2 Preliminary analysis of the level of support for the 'Key Proposals' was set out in CAB2139. Since the report was considered, Officers have now reconsidered the enforcement and control of the parking scheme with a view to reduce the abuse and misuse of permits.
- 2.3 The Proposals still to consider and evaluate are:
- Proposal 6 - Users of 'Residents' permits in 'Inner' Zones should be permitted to designate a second, adjacent zone, to the one in which they live in order to allow more opportunities to find parking spaces;
 - Proposal 7 - The operation of residents' parking bays in the 'Inner' zones be extended to include enforcement on Sundays, once the effects of Sunday parking charges have been assessed;
 - Proposal 8 - For residents eligible for a parking permit who do not own a car, and to compensate for the loss of 'visitor' permits, it is proposed to offer an annual Resident (Non car owner) permit.
- 2.4 Proposal 8 – following Cabinet's decision in response to report CAB2139 that 'visitor' permits will not now be replaced, there is no reason to progress this proposal and therefore no further analysis has been done. However, a number of respondents commented that if abuse of the system was occurring, then it would most likely to be related to the 'selling-on' of the second visitor permit and that an effective way of controlling this would be to limit all households to one visitor permit. Whilst there is some merit in this proposal, in view of the strong public comment on this subject it is not thought appropriate to re-institute such a proposal at this time, but rather to concentrate on other methods of enforcing the operation of the Scheme.
- 2.5 Proposal 7 – Since the agreement of recommendations set out in CAB2170 on 19 May 2011 (which revoked the implementation of Sunday parking charges) there is no reason to further consider the implementation of this proposal and it is recommended that no further analysis or action is carried out.
- 2.6 Proposal 6 – This proposal came about because of issues raised by some inner zone residents and ward councillors who perceived inequalities in the distribution of parking permits and spaces within the controlled parking zones. It was intended that the proposal would allow the residents in these zones more opportunity to find a parking space without excessive numbers of vehicle movements' circulating through the town centre.
- 2.7 An assessment made as part of the preparatory work in autumn 2010 (see Appendix 5) showed that there are capacity constraints in most zones to varying degrees, but is considerably worse in the inner zones despite fewer

permits being issued. In the most constrained zones (M & R) there is less than 0.5 parking space per residents permit issued.

- 2.8 Whilst the proposal was well supported (62%) by those people within the inner zones, the level of support in the outer zones is less, with 51% in support and 39% opposed (10% did not respond). Furthermore, consideration of the results in Appendix 2 shows that the individual outer zones most likely to be affected by the proposal (for example respondents in Zone D who would be affected by 'dual-zone' permits from Zones M & N) are likely to be opposed at the formal consultation stage, and this could result in considerable costs being incurred without achieving a clear overall level of support.
- 2.9 It is therefore recommended that whilst there still may be some merit in 'Proposal 6', it may not gain sufficient support from all those affected and that other options may be more fruitful in improving the situation for some of the inner zones.
- 2.10 An alternative scheme to changing the way permits operate is to review the available parking spaces on-street, as it has been identified that a number of additional spaces can be created in some streets. Whilst a complete review would take some considerable time, a phased approach, with a focus on the most constrained zones in the first instance, could deliver significant improvements in the short term.
- 2.11 As a first example, in Park Avenue it is anticipated that an additional 15 new spaces can be created along the east side of the road. If these were allocated as 'shared' spaces for 'M' and 'D' zones, then this alone would be an increase of over 40% of spaces for zone 'M' and increase the current spaces available per permit from 0.44 to 0.63. To achieve this it is recommended that authority be given to review where additional spaces could be provided in the Inner Zones, and advertise amendments to the traffic order to provide and regulate the use of such additional spaces, starting with the specific proposals for the creation of new on-street spaces in Park Avenue.
- 2.12 It is not recommended to review which existing parking areas / streets are allocated to which zones. This was considered in reviews of the scheme in 2005, 2008 and 2010 and it was concluded that any widespread change would cause raise as many issues as it offered solutions.
- 2.13 There is an argument that suggests that providing additional spaces could encourage car ownership. However it has never been the City Council's intention to reduce car ownership (only the non-essential use of cars) and there are clear examples where constraints on the town centre parking zones can result in residents having to drive around the one-way system, searching for spaces. Unfortunately, this area coincides with the designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and as such this consequence is not helpful in alleviating the Air Quality problem. Furthermore, recent changes to the one-way system in Parchment Street mean that Zone M permit holders have to negotiate half of the one-way system before they can search for a space in a parallel street in their zone.

3 Town Forum View

- 3.1 A report was taken to the Town Forum on 8 June 2011 seeking their views and asking them to indicate which issues covered by the consultation they wished to be considered by Cabinet. The relevant minutes from the Town Forum meeting are as follows:

The Forum referred to the results of the public consultation exercise on the residents' parking scheme review. The Head of Access and Infrastructure explained the likely consequences of implementing Proposal 6, i.e. users of residents' permits in inner zones being permitted to designate a second, adjacent zone to the one in which they live, in the hope that this could provide more opportunities to park. He explained that the Forum may wish to have regard to these consequences as part of its response to Cabinet on the proposals.

The Forum referred to the comments made during the public participation session of the meeting, as summarised above. The Forum discussed Proposal 6, and also had regard to Appendix 4 (comments made as part of the consultation responses) and in particular, Comment 20 – 'that use of residents' permits in Council car parks should be allowed'. It was noted that not all zoned areas had easily accessible adjacent zones or ones that were likely to have sufficient capacity to deal with any overspill from more congested neighbouring zones. Further to questions, the Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that off-peak car parking permits for use after 4pm and from 8am to 9am and at weekends, were available to residents for £100 per annum.

At conclusion of discussion, the Forum agreed that there should be further consideration of the use of Council owned car parks for possible residents' parking in certain circumstances, although it was accepted that this was likely to require a change of existing Council policy and would need to be considered carefully. Members considered that this proposal was unlikely to impact on car park revenue, especially as some town centre car parks were underused in some cases. The Forum agreed this could provide a pragmatic solution to congested parking in some inner zones and this should be considered in conjunction with Proposal 6. However, Members also agreed that there should be further consideration by Cabinet as to whether Proposal 6 was appropriate and that there should be further public consultation on any revised proposals.

THE TOWN FORUM RESOLVED:

1. That the results of the public consultation on the Winchester Residents' Parking Scheme be noted.

2. That Cabinet be requested to note the Forum's suggestions (as set out in detail above) regarding the possible extension of the use of resident's car park permits in inner zone areas and that this should be considered in conjunction with Proposal 6.

- 3.2 The Town Forum has suggested that any implementation of Proposal 6 is subject to further consultation. In order to take such a proposal forward it would require formal advertisement as a Traffic Regulation Order amendment which would necessitate a statutory consultation, in addition to the considerable detailed consultation that has already occurred in December 2010 providing a zone by zone (Appendix 2) assessment of support for the Proposal.

4 Other issues identified

- 4.1 Appendix 4 lists the comments made as part of consultation responses and the numbers of occurrences of those comments were made. Many of the comments were in direct relation to the proposals, and effectively show the public opinion on the proposals made.
- 4.2 49 respondents commented that Residents' permits (& scratchcards) should be valid for use in the WCC off-street car parks. The Council does already allow a concession that allows 'inner' zone permits to use certain car parks on Saturdays, though this concession does not apply to visitor permits or scratchcards.
- 4.3 The Council operates a range of season tickets and tariffs, including off-peak parking permits. However, these are set to reflect the commercial and market value of the off-street parking facility. The price for an off-street town centre season ticket is between £1104 and £1472 per annum. The purpose of the 'residents' parking scheme' is to manage and control the on-street parking availability, and the cost of resident parking permits is set to cover the cost of the running the on-street parking controls and therefore do not reflect the commercial value of off-street parking facilities. The notion of allowing the use of a £22 or £50 resident permit access to off-street parking could cause the Council significant financial difficulties and be inequitable to other residents of the District who may not qualify.
- 4.4 Whilst it is accepted that there is now spare capacity in some off-street car parks, this will be reviewed as part of the overall car parking charges review scheduled for autumn 2011, and as part of that review it is envisaged that the pricing structure will be examined with a view to optimising the use of the car parks. The use of further 'residents' parking concessions' could be considered as part of that review.
- 4.5 A cost review of the operation of the residents parking scheme was recommended as an action in CAB2083(TP) and this is covered in a report elsewhere on this agenda.

5 Progress on other parking schemes

- 5.1 At the meeting of 1 December 2010 Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee (report [CAB 2083\(TP\)](#) refers), the future programme of possible new and expanded parking zones for Winchester were agreed. These were set out according to the following priority – Weeke, Stanmore, Abbots Barton, Highcliffe and Winnall.

- 5.2 Changes to the Weeke area should be completed in August 2011. Consultation on the Stanmore area closed on 22 July, and these results are now being collated with a view to agree the way forward with the local members. Abbots Barton is next in the agreed programme, with schemes for Highcliffe and Winnall scheduled for 2012/13. Any new zones are developed in full consultation with affected residents in order that new options for parking controls are considered and evaluated.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

6 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CHANGE PLANS
(RELEVANCE TO):

- 6.1 The proposals accord with the corporate priority for safeguarding our high quality environment.

7 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 7.1 The further work identified will be carried out by existing staff resources within the Access and Infrastructure Team.

8 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 8.1 None identified.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Responses received to consultation.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation Responses (all proposals)

Appendix 2: Consultation Responses to Proposal 6

Appendix 3: Consultation Responses to Proposal 7

Appendix 4: Comments made as part of consultation responses

Appendix 5: Zone capacity assessment

Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation Responses

Proposals 1 - 5

Do you agree with the package of key proposals?

All respondents			Outer Zone residents			Inner Zone residents		
1233	No	66%	980	No	71%	246	No	52%
517	Yes	28%	329	Yes	24%	187	Yes	40%
31	partially	2%	16	partially	1%	15	partially	3%
84	blank	5%	57	blank	4%	25	blank	5%
1865			1382			473		

Proposal 6

Do you agree with the following proposal? - Users of 'Residents' permits in 'Inner' Zones should be permitted to designate a second, adjacent zone, to the one in which they live in order to allow more opportunities to find parking spaces

All respondents		
684	No	37%
996	Yes	53%
185	blank	10%
1865		

Outer Zone residents		
539	No	39%
701	Yes	51%
142	blank	10%
1382		

Inner Zone residents		
144	No	30%
291	Yes	62%
38	blank	8%
473		

Proposal 7

Do you agree with the following proposal? - The operation of residents parking bays in the 'Inner' zones be extended to include enforcement on Sundays, once the effects of Sunday parking charges have been assessed

All respondents		
749	No	40%
909	Yes	49%
207	blank	11%
1865		

Outer Zone residents		
611	No	44%
609	Yes	44%
162	blank	12%
1382		

Inner Zone residents		
135	No	29%
299	Yes	63%
39	blank	8%
473		

Proposal 8

Do you agree with the following proposal? - For residents eligible for a parking permit who do not own a car, and to compensate for the loss of 'visitor' permits, it is proposed to offer an annual Resident (Non car owner) permit. (N.B. This type of permit will only be issued where no other permits have been issued to the household concerned.)

All respondents		
676	No	36%
982	Yes	53%
207	blank	11%
1865		

Outer Zone residents		
515	No	37%
717	Yes	52%
150	blank	11%
1382		

Inner Zone residents		
160	No	34%
262	Yes	55%
51	blank	11%
473		

Appendix 2: Consultation Responses to Proposal 6

Do you agree with the following proposal? - Users of 'Residents' permits in 'Inner' Zones should be permitted to designate a second, adjacent zone, to the one in which they live in order to allow more opportunities to find parking spaces

All respondents			Outer Zone residents			Inner Zone residents		
684	No	37%	539	No	39%	144	No	30%
996	Yes	53%	701	Yes	51%	291	Yes	62%
185	blank	10%	142	blank	10%	38	blank	8%
1865			1382			473		

Zone analysis - Outer Zones

Zone A			Zone D			Zone E			Zone F		
23	No	35%	40	No	63%	1	No	13%	8	No	16%
42	Yes	64%	20	Yes	31%	4	Yes	50%	32	Yes	63%
1	blank	2%	4	blank	6%	3	blank	38%	11	blank	22%
66			64			8			51		
Zone G			Zone H			Zone I			Zone J		
10	No	45%	25	No	32%	70	No	38%	69	No	51%
10	Yes	45%	49	Yes	62%	98	Yes	54%	52	Yes	38%
2	blank	9%	5	blank	6%	15	blank	8%	15	blank	11%
22			79			183			136		
Zone K			Zone L			Zone O			Zone T		
52	No	38%	87	No	46%	4	No	22%	59	No	37%
72	Yes	52%	81	Yes	43%	11	Yes	61%	83	Yes	52%
14	blank	10%	21	blank	11%	3	blank	17%	19	blank	12%
138			189			18			161		
Zone U			Zone V			Zone W			Zone X		
2	No	14%	33	No	35%	7	No	21%	44	No	37%
8	Yes	57%	56	Yes	60%	21	Yes	64%	59	Yes	50%
4	blank	29%	4	blank	4%	5	blank	15%	15	blank	13%
14			93			33			118		
Zone Y			Zone 2a&b								
2	No	50%	2	No	50%						
1	Yes	25%	2	Yes	50%						
1	blank	25%		blank	0%						
4			4								

Zone analysis - Inner Zones

Zone B			Zone C			Zone M			Zone N		
38	No	41%	25	No	34%	9	No	14%	26	No	41%
47	Yes	51%	46	Yes	62%	52	Yes	83%	28	Yes	44%
8	blank	9%	3	blank	4%	2	blank	3%	9	blank	14%
93			74			63			63		
Zone P			Zone Q			Zone R			Zone S		
8	No	22%	14	No	27%	2	No	8%	22	No	35%
23	Yes	64%	32	Yes	63%	21	Yes	84%	37	Yes	59%
5	blank	14%	5	blank	10%	2	blank	8%	4	blank	6%
36			51			25			63		

Appendix 3: Consultation Responses to Proposal 7

Do you agree with the following proposal? - The operation of residents parking bays in the 'Inner' zones be extended to include enforcement on Sundays, once the effects of Sunday parking charges have been assessed

All respondents			Outer Zone residents			Inner Zone residents		
749	No	40%	611	No	44%	135	No	29%
909	Yes	49%	609	Yes	44%	299	Yes	63%
207	blank	11%	162	blank	12%	39	blank	8%
1865			1382			473		

Zone analysis - Outer Zones

Zone A			Zone D			Zone E			Zone F		
27	No	41%	18	No	28%	1	No	13%	15	No	29%
33	Yes	50%	44	Yes	69%	4	Yes	50%	25	Yes	48%
6	blank	9%	2	blank	3%	3	blank	38%	12	blank	23%
66			64			8			52		
Zone G			Zone H			Zone I			Zone J		
17	No	77%	34	No	43%	76	No	42%	65	No	48%
4	Yes	18%	39	Yes	49%	91	Yes	50%	49	Yes	36%
1	blank	5%	6	blank	8%	16	blank	9%	22	blank	16%
22			79			183			136		
Zone K			Zone L			Zone O			Zone T		
68	No	49%	92	No	49%	3	No	17%	90	No	56%
52	Yes	38%	75	Yes	40%	11	Yes	61%	54	Yes	33%
18	blank	13%	22	blank	12%	4	blank	22%	18	blank	11%
138			189			18			162		
Zone U			Zone V			Zone W			Zone X		
4	No	29%	44	No	47%	5	No	15%	48	No	41%
8	Yes	57%	41	Yes	44%	25	Yes	76%	52	Yes	44%
2	blank	14%	8	blank	9%	3	blank	9%	18	blank	15%
14			93			33			118		
Zone Y			Zone 2a&b								
2	No	50%	2	No	67%						
1	Yes	25%	1	Yes	33%						
1	blank	25%	0	blank	0%						
4			3								

Zone analysis - Inner Zones

Zone B			Zone C			Zone M			Zone N		
39	No	42%	29	No	39%	11	No	17%	19	No	28%
48	Yes	52%	42	Yes	57%	50	Yes	78%	38	Yes	57%
6	blank	6%	3	blank	4%	3	blank	5%	10	blank	15%
93			74			64			67		
Zone P			Zone Q			Zone R			Zone S		
14	No	39%	11	No	22%	3	No	12%	9	No	14%
18	Yes	50%	35	Yes	69%	20	Yes	80%	48	Yes	76%
4	blank	11%	5	blank	10%	2	blank	8%	6	blank	10%
36			51			25			63		

Appendix 4: Comments made as part of consultation responses

Comment Made	No. times
1 Opposed to the proposals on grounds of flexibility / practicality	301
2 Opposed to the proposals on grounds of 100 Scratchcards insufficient	253
3 Keep system as it is / no change the system / prefer current system	224
4 Opposed to the proposals on grounds of cost / economics	177
5 Dont agree with increasing No. of residents permits as there are too many cars already	157
6 why should NCO housholds have a flexible permit – open to abuse/can use scratchcards	150
7 Need 'visitor' permits – as these are used for child care / carers	148
8 Opposed to No 6 - 2 nd zone designation as it will allow cause more problems	128
9 Current system is ok better enforcement is required	127
10 Endorse key proposals – but with reservations	107
11 Opposed to Sunday charges / restrictions / more restrictions	100
12 Proposals are financially motivated by WCC to balance books / generate income	94
13 Current system is being abuse / open to abuse	87
14 Need more information on costs / proposals should cost no more / less for low incomes	85
15 Scratchcards are difficult to use / administer / complete / easy to make mistakes	71
16 Traffic management issues: searching for spaces / one way system / SY & DY lines	71
17 Support for 1 resident & 1 visitor allocation / reduce allocation to 1 visitor permit	57
18 Parking v. difficult / No of permits exceed spaces / something needs to be done	53
19 Support for SUNDAY charges / restrictions / more restrictions	52
20 Allow use of permits in WCC Car parks / allow scratchcards in same	49
21 The RPS / Scheme should be use to limit the number of cars people have in the centre	40
22 Need to increase the number of spaces / re-evaluate zones to increase bays	37
23 Scratchcards are still open to abuse	33
24 Support No6 - 2 nd zone designation as it will allow equitable/fair distribution of permits	30
25 No evidence of abuse / Where is evidence of abuse / no great level of abuse	30
26 Proposals will encourage 2 car house holds and discourage 1 car households	28
27 Need 'visitor' permits - use / change variety of cars / vehicles / rent cars	27
28 Proposals are too complicated	24
29 Opposed to environmental impacts of scratchcards / waste of resources / litter	22
30 Scratchcard costs need to be cheaper £20 for 100	22
31 No. of Residents permits given should be reduced in line with drive & garage spaces	20
32 Remove shared residents / P&D bays and make them all residents parking only	18
33 2 nd Residents permit is no use to 1-car households	17
34 Proposals will make the current situation worse/limit access/cause overcrowding	15
35 Over night visitors would need two scratchcards	14
36 proposals will adversely affect church visitors (no. 7)	14
37 The price / cost of permits is too low / should be higher to deter fraud	12
38 All bays should be individually marked	11
39 No benefit / Point to the proposals	10
40 Why cant Non-car owning residents (proposal 8) have 2No. NCOP's & scratchcards	9
41 Make scratchcards valid of longer /1 day	8
42 Need to retain guesthouse permits	7
43 Scratchcards are too expensive / should not have exp date	7
44 No more town centre development as this worsens / worsened the problems	6
45 Need to encourage residents with more than 1 car to relocate out of the town	6
46 Longer / different enforcement times required	6
47 Residents permits need to have the 'address' to deal with bad parking / emergencies	4
48 100 scratchcards is excessive	4
49 Amenity permits are being abused	3
50 Extend proposal 6 to outer zone.	3
51 Dual / Second zone permits (as existing) should be scrapped	2
52 Cost of permit to = car length/Environmental car factors	2
53 Alternative operation system needed	1
54 Oppose to new developmnt being exempt of RPS	1
Total comments coded	2984

Appendix 5: Zone capacity assessment

Inner Zones			Permits Issued			Spaces per Resident permit	Occupancy level	% visitor permits
Zone	Descriptor / Road	No. of Spaces	Resident	Visitor	Total			
B	Wales Street / Water Lane	197	134	205	339	1.47	68%	60%
C	Culver Road / Cannon Street	122	118	130	248	1.03	97%	52%
M	Parchement Street / St Peters Street	35	80	82	162	0.44	229%	51%
N	Lower Brook Street / Lawn St	73	77	144	221	0.95	105%	65%
P	Andover Rd / Hyde Close	37	71	62	133	0.52	192%	47%
Q	Sussex Street / Gladstone Street	56	71	60	131	0.79	127%	46%
R	Tower Street / Staple Gardens	18	52	27	79	0.35	289%	34%
S	St Thomas' Street / The Square	71	109	138	247	0.65	154%	56%
Totals		609	712	848	1560	0.86	117%	54%

Outer Zones			Permits Issued			Spaces per Resident permit	Occupancy level	% visitor permits
Zone	Descriptor / Road	No. of Spaces	Resident	Visitor	Total			
A	Christchurch Rd / Edgar Rd North	194	91	128	219	2.13	47%	58%
D	Gordon Road / Park Ave	125	100	116	216	1.25	80%	54%
E	Berewecke Ave / Berewecke Rd	15	2	13	15	7.50	13%	87%
F	Christchurch Rd / Edgar Rd South	262	82	130	212	3.20	31%	61%
G	Poets Way / Byron Avenue	100	13	43	56	7.69	13%	77%
H	Fairfield Road / Conifer Close	99	104	115	219	0.95	105%	53%
I	King Alfred Place / Saxon Rd	362	281	351	632	1.29	78%	56%
J	Clifton Road / Clifton Terrace	183	155	258	413	1.18	85%	62%
K	Cheriton Road / Western Road	345	168	247	415	2.05	49%	60%
L	Hatherley Road / Cranworth Road	351	269	305	574	1.30	77%	53%
O	Abbey Hill Road / Northlands Drive	128	28	50	78	4.57	22%	64%
T	Greenhill Road / Westhill Park	407	153	292	445	2.66	38%	66%
U	Sparkford Road / Erskine Road	85	32	68	100	2.66	38%	68%
V	St Faiths Road / Kingsgate Road	232	126	142	268	1.84	54%	53%
W	Wharf Hill	40	63	60	123	0.63	158%	49%
X	St Catherine's Road / Milland Rd	434	210	283	493	2.07	48%	57%
W	Queens Road / Kerrfield	20	2	10	12	10.00	10%	83%
2A	Cromwell Road	13	3	5	8	4.33	23%	63%
2B	Staple Gardens	30	9	10	19	3.33	30%	53%
Totals		3425	1891	2626	4517	1.81	55%	58%

Overall Total	4034	2603	3474	6077	1.55	65%	57%
----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------	------------