

BOROUGH OF POOLE

PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

24 MAY 2016

**CONSULTATION REPORT
CHARGING FOR PARKING IN SOME PARKS IN POOLE**

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 To inform members of the outcome of the consultation exercise regarding proposals to introduce charges in Hamworthy, Ham Common, Lake Pier, Newfoundland Drive Skateboard and Whitecliff car parks during the period 1 March and 31 October. To seek views from the committee on the content of the report to assist in further work ahead.
- 1.2 To give consideration to a number of petitions as received by the Council in relation to this matter.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Place Overview and Scrutiny Members recommend to Cabinet that:
 - 2.1.1 the consultation report and petitions received be noted
 - 2.1.2. based on the consultation feedback and related petitions received to provide a Member overview to help in further work required on mitigation
 - 2.1.3 further work is enacted with key stakeholder follow up as required to help clarify and then facilitate a way forward.
- 2.2 Members are asked to note that Cabinet shall consider the consultation results and the initial input via the Chairman's Report from Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee with a view to help advise on further work required. Officers would aim to consider the concerns being raised through consultation and help identify any mitigation through further recommendation.

3 BACKGROUND/INFORMATION

- 3.1 In January 2016 Cabinet approved that formal consultation should proceed on the proposals in order to seek the views of the public. The Consultation Report April 2016 is provided in Appendix A.
- 3.2 The formal consultation has followed Gunning Principles and its design was comprehensive to include for high profile communication followed by a series of surveys coupled with the opportunity for the public to fully engage through "drop in" sessions. Target groups were defined in advance and different ways of seeking out local views then progressed to gain a good public response.

- 3.3 The Consultation itself ran from 22nd February to 6th April 2016 and was conducted in accord with pre-defined principles.
- 3.4 The detail of the process followed is outlined in the report and officers would like to take this opportunity to thank the public for their own effort in engaging and for the many comments now provided.
- 3.5 In addition the following petitions showing an opposition have been received, as reported to Council on 26th April (Report shown in Appendix B):
- Whitecliff Car Park;
 - Specific parking restrictions (yellow Line) on Sandbanks Road;
 - Lake Pier; and
 - Hamworthy Park.

4. THE NEED FOR THE PROJECT

- 4.1 The need varies with each park and the response has been very helpful in identifying the issues that the proposed charging would need to consider.
- 4.2 The proposal is designed to better control parking activity and generate some funding to help assist in improving the quality of the parks and parking facilities themselves by countering future budget pressures - all to the benefit of those that wish to continue to use our quality open space.
- 4.3 Although limited data is available some use of parks by non-park goers has caused some concern in the past with time restrictions implemented already. Prior to consultation officers were already aware of some warranted concessions that would need to be considered in a further design. The considerable feedback now received has helped to confirm the use as well as the potential impacts that may result through a charge.
- 4.4 There is also an additional tension shown amongst the public with respect to time restriction to any length of stay. This varies by park.

5. CONSULTATION RESULTS

- 5.1 The key headline results from the consultation exercise were:

Over 1,700 responses were received to the consultation:

- 465 responses from the Residents' Sample Survey (31% response).
- 1279 responses received in General Public Consultation - open to all

- 5.2 In general the majority of respondents dislike the current proposal.

63- 71% of the residents
81- 90% of the general public.

- 5.3 In the Resident Survey, over 40% of respondents suggested they would not be impacted at all by charging in Hamworthy Park; Lake Pier; Newfoundland Drive and Rockley Park.

- 5.4 The variance of perceived impact between individual parks varied considerably from 19% to 57%.
- 5.5 In contrast, over 40% of General Public respondents felt that they would be impacted a lot by charging in Hamworthy Park (50%); Lake Pier (44%). The latter car park being used by a high number of sailors and those that canoe each weather and tide dependant in defining their length of stay.
- 5.6 The highest level of perceived impact in both surveys was for Whitecliff Car Park, in part due to a relatively high use as well as concerns over additional parking impacts on street. This was followed by Hamworthy Park with concern generally less for the remaining three parks.
- 5.7 It is clear that some people feel so strongly that they indicate that they would use the parks less frequently or not at all while many others would existing simply adjust their use accordingly. The majority of respondents disagreed with the proposals. In doing so many people show concern about paying for something that in the past has had no charge. Some do not feel the proposal is justified. Full detail on stated reasons is given in the report itself.
- 5.8 Although there is some support for the proposals in their current form across all parks the majority of respondents simply dislike the thought of paying for parking in our parks. This is not surprising given that the relevant parking is currently free. The feeling is stronger in the results from the open survey.
- 5.9 Respondents are relatively well satisfied with the parking facilities provided although 66% of residents do not agree with the suggested tariff. Less (53%) oppose the alternative tariff suggested for a lower day rate charge of £3.80 at Lake Pier Car Park.
- 5.10 The majority (59%) oppose the implementation of a park based parking permit at an annual cost of £30 per annum despite this option potentially offering better values for money for those that use the parks more often.
- 5.11 The report itself in Appendix A provides further and more detailed outcomes and views.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Further feasibility work is now required to consider the impacts identified by the respondents with any mitigation then carefully considered where possible for each of the parks. This will influence financial assumptions made thus far.
- 6.2 Further work could be done to boost general awareness about the cost of keeping the parks and associated parking facilities maintained against the real financial pressure that the Council faces in the future.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Prior to Consultation Officers checked the legality of the proposal. The scale of mitigation necessary has yet to be defined and where possible would be based on the detail of the consultation results.

7.2 In the event of any charge being approved a 28-day statutory notification period for changes applies to Off-Street Parking Place Orders with an advertisement required.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The consultation has provided some clarity regarding the perceived impacts for certain users of the parks.

8.2 With inadequate funding towards the cost of maintenance both the quality of parks and their related parking facilities are at risk.

9. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 A full Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) has been completed (Appendix C)

9.2 The EQIA group have considered the consultation report in full and have identified the need for some mitigation and in particular for parents with children to encourage more leisure and health activities for children as well as for disability groups. This was particularly the case for Hamworthy, Ham common and Whitecliff parks.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 As a first step a general proposal based on charging in five parks was formed. The initial proposals were designed to better control parking activity and generate some funding to help assist in improving the quality of the parks and parking facilities by countering council budget pressures - all to the benefit of those that wish to continue to use our quality open space.

10.2 The Council has consulted and engaged with local people and as a process this has been relatively successful in gaining valuable insight into genuine concern over potential impacts.

10.3 Although there is some support for the proposals the majority of respondents do not like the proposals in their current form. The majority simply do not like the thought of paying for parking in the parks. Many detailed concerns have been raised that now need to be considered further before a way forward can then be devised.

10.4 Both the Consultation Report and EQIA process have helped and officers need further time to establish suitable mitigation to further inform the way forward.

JULIAN MCLAUGHLIN
SERVICE UNIT HEAD OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Contact Officer: Jason Benjamin, Parking Services Manager

Appendix A: Consultation Report - April 2016.

Appendix B: Council Report relating to Petitions received – Council April 2016

Appendix C: Equality Impact Assessment Report - April 2016