



NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Review of the Implementation of the North Hertfordshire Parking Strategy 2009 - 2019

**Report of the
Parking Strategy Implementation
Overview and Scrutiny Task and Finish Group**

May 2011

CONTENTS

	Page Numbers
Membership	2
Foreword	3
Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	6
Findings and evidence considered by the group	7
Conclusions	13
Recommendations	14
Appendices	
Appendix A - Scope	15
Appendix B - Programme for the Scrutiny Event	17
Appendix C - Presentations	18

Members of the Committee

Cllr Richard Thake (Chair)

Cllr David Billing (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Paul Clark

Cllr Michael Paterson

Cllr Paul Marment

Portfolio Holder

Cllr Thomas Brindley – Planning, Transport and Economic Development

Lead Officer

Ian Fullstone, Head of Development and Building Control

Support Officers

Jim Brown, Policy Manager
Rueben Ayavoo, Policy Officer
Laura Lack, Policy Officer

FOREWORD

Statement by Councillor Richard Thake



It was a privilege to be invited to chair this Task and Finish Group, the first time this 'single day' format had been utilised for a North Hertfordshire District Council Scrutiny.

There was a clear remit for the Group, which was to examine the implementation of the strategy and not the content thereof, but, with a key focus on the Baldock 'Area Wide Review' (the first such review of its type) which had recently commenced.

Overall, the Parking Strategy emerged well from the scrutiny process and was found to be robust and well implemented. In addition the approach being taken with regard the Baldock Area Wide Review was endorsed and recommended to continue into other reviews.

Whilst members recognised that the format of this scrutiny might not be suitable for every task, it undoubtedly worked well in this case and the group believed it should be made available as part of the suite of options for future scrutiny of strategy and implementation policies across the authority, as and where appropriate

Richard Thake
Chairman

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Task and Finish Group wish to thank the following officers from North Hertfordshire District Council:

- Simon Young, Transport Policy Officer
- Steve Crowley, Contracts and Project Manager
- Jim Brown, Policy and Scrutiny Manager
- Reuben Ayavoo, Policy Officer
- Laura Lack, former Policy Officer
- Ian Fullstone, Head of Development and Building Control

All who gave their time to meet with the Group and provide information, advice and ideas that helped the Group to achieve their aims and objectives.

The Task and Finish Group are grateful to the two external witnesses, Andrew Pulham, Parking Manager at East Hertfordshire District Council and Richard Jones, N&E Area Service Manager at Hertfordshire Highways.

The Group also wish to thank the following Councillors in their role as witnesses. Cllr Tom Brindley as Portfolio Holder with responsibility for parking and Cllr Michael Muir in his role as a member of the North Hertfordshire Highways Joint Member Panel.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 In February 2011, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee established the Parking Strategy Task and Finish Group to review the Council's Parking Strategy 2009-2019.
- 1.2 It was also proposed that the Group undertook the review in an alternative format, that being a one day or two half day meetings.
- 1.3 The Group set a scope for their activity, this would identify the areas the group wished to explore, witnesses to interview and what they aimed to produce, their outcomes, at the conclusion of the review. This scoping document can be found at Appendix A at the end of this report.
- 1.4 The remit for the Group was to review the implementation of the strategy not the content of the strategy. A key focus for the Group were the Area Wide Reviews, at the time the Group was established the first review in Baldock had commenced and the next town scheduled for review was Hitchin.
- 1.5 The Group carried out their work on 20th May 2011 and reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 9th June 2011.
- 1.6 This report outlines the discussion and findings from the scrutiny process, these can be found at Page 7. Overall the Parking Strategy was found to be robust and emerged well from the scrutiny process and overall is being implemented well. In addition the approach being taken with regard the Baldock Area Wide Review was endorsed and recommended to continue into other reviews.

2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 Parking was decriminalised in 2003 following which the Council published its first parking strategy 2004-2009. The second edition of the strategy was extended to cover ten years and built upon the previous five years experience of managing on-street parking enforcement as well as demand for additional parking controls and pressure for changes in how town centre car parking is managed.
- 2.2 The Council's role with regard to on-street parking remains one of managing and enforcement of all on-street parking restrictions in the district. This management and enforcement role extends into the off-street car parks the Council owns and/or manages.
- 2.3 The Council's agreement with Hertfordshire County Council (HCC i.e. the Highway Authority) does not include the implementation of other on-street parking controls (i.e. Traffic Regulation Orders – TRO's) that are intended to address safety or public amenity issues.
- 2.4 The Parking Strategy 2009 - 2019 contains twenty four policies
- Management and resources
 - Off street car park capacity
 - Physical improvement to car parks
 - Car park management system
 - Reviewing tariffs
 - Charging for evenings and Sundays
 - Other services in Council car parks
 - On street parking provision
 - On street charging
 - Parking for blue badge holders
 - Servicing and loading
 - Emergency services' access
 - Powered two wheeler and bicycle parking
 - Taxi parking
 - Bus, coach, HGV and caravan/trailer parking
 - Updating traffic regulation orders
 - Identifying on street parking problem areas
 - Identify solution to on street parking problems
 - Consultation
 - Future parking control areas
 - Smallscale parking improvements
 - Review of existing controlled parking zones
 - Blue badge holder parking bays
 - Parking at new developments and existing controlled parking zones
- 2.5 The Parking Strategy supports the Council's own Corporate Priorities of Town Centres, Green issues and Sustainable Development.

3. FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE FROM WITNESSES

3.1 Cllr Tom Brindley, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Transport and Economic Development

- 3.1.1 The Portfolio Holder gave a short introduction to the Council's parking strategy following decriminalisation of parking in 2003, the Council's provision of off street parking was also covered within the introductory comments.
- 3.1.2 Members referred to paragraph 3.6 of the strategy and noted that there was a difficult balance that needed to be achieved between actions seeking to tackle climate change whilst supporting town centres and maximising income. The Portfolio Holder (TB) indicated that the strategy can support the use of alternate modes of transport and through the provision of information reduce the amount of time that is spent driving around looking for a place to park. TB did not believe the strategy could control the amount of car use.
- 3.1.3 The Group asked whether the Council had any evidence about the number of vehicles driving around looking for an empty space. TB indicated that monitoring had been undertaken but there was no 'formal' evidence. Members then asked whether the provision of real time information to inform drivers of occupancy levels in car parks was possible as it was felt to be important. TB informed the Group that money had been allocated within the capital program to allow the implementation of a system that would monitor the flow of traffic in and out of car parks (Recommendation 5.1.11).
- 3.1.4 The Panel recognised the value of controlling the parking within town centres, but also recognise the tension that can then result between the needs of workers and customers. TB acknowledged that tensions can arise which is why each car park should have its needs assessed. Knebworth Area Review identified the need to balance the needs of some businesses who wish to introduce charging for long stay parking in order to discourage the use of car parks by workers and therefore allow space for customers, against those businesses who wanted all day parking for their employees. TB explained that options were being explored that allowed for a flexible use, such as allocated spaces for shop workers as well a charging structure for other bays to encourage a turn over of cars.
- 3.1.5 This outcome seemed to support the need for area wide reviews, Members queried how these would work for an area larger than Knebworth and whether the Council had sufficient resources to undertake them. TB identified that the Hitchin review would take longer than a year with public consultation and that additional resources would be provided as necessary. TB explained that the allocation of permits is being looked at in order to maximise income as there is currently a subsidy of £120,000 in relation to residents permits.
- 3.1.6 Members referred to paragraph 5.20 within the strategy which allows for the Council to review its town centre parking tariffs every three years, although the action plan indicates an annual review as per Policy 5. TB explained that reviews are undertaken every year but do not necessarily change the charges each year. Members noted that should usage drop in a particular car park following a tariff change then a review should include the wider area. TB supported this as consideration needs to be given to other influences such a street closures. TB indicated that it is also important to appreciate that other car park providers such as the Heritage Foundation may subsidise their charges, the Council needs to consider the best use of its assets.

- 3.1.7 Members also wished to support the needs of residents and these should not be affected by commuters who were not prepared to pay car park tariffs, but would park on residential streets.
- 3.1.8 The possibility of allowing commuters to purchase parking permits was discussed and supported. As permits could be sold for entire zones, concern was expressed that commuters would park nearest to their destination causing difficulties for residents in that part of the zone. TB acknowledged there were difficulties that would need to be addressed should permits be offered for sale to commuters. Members wished to reinforce Policies 18 and 22 in that when amending controlled parking zones, the amendments should not undermine the principal of supporting residents and/or local businesses (Conclusion 4.1.2 and Recommendation 5.1.7)
- 3.1.9 The Group asked whether 'pay on exit' had been considered to allow car park users to extend their stay should they wish to. TB said that a review had been undertaken and no existing car parks had been identified as suitable. This however would remain a consideration for any new car parks. TB did report that the restrictions on topping up parking payments had been removed and that topping up could be undertaken by phone.
- 3.1.10 Members questioned the review of tariffs under Policy 5 and that the setting of tariffs is not undertaken at a district level. TB explained that the four towns are different, in Letchworth the Heritage Foundation subsidise their car parks, Baldock until recently had free parking and in Hitchin the car parks are very heavily used. TB felt that it was important to maintain the vitality of our town centres.
- 3.1.11 Policy 15 was discussed (bus, coach, HGV and caravan/trailer parking), a question was asked as to whether any work was being undertaken with regard to this policy and the various industrial sites. TB said that this policy is considered within the area wide reviews and was not aware of a demand. Members felt it was more about access for HGV's to industrial areas via residential streets.
- 3.1.12 A question was asked as to whether parking enforcement on foot was the most efficient method. TB felt that given the size of the areas which have regular patrols, 'on-foot' enforcement is the most appropriate.
- 3.1.13 The Group discussed new developments and the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents. The objective of reducing car use rather than car ownership was seen as desirable. TB supported this approach, this objective may become achievable with the implementation of forthcoming legislation (Recommendation 5.1.10).
- 3.1.14 Paragraph 6.5 was discussed in relation to the migration of parking problems to areas outside of the controlled zones. When residents not currently experiencing any parking problems are offered controlled parking to offset this migration there seems to be a reluctance and a lack of understanding of future problems. TB said that lessons had been learnt from the Knebworth and Baldock review processes and that further public consultation may be needed to raise awareness (Conclusion 4.1.3).
- 3.1.15 Members asked when the new car park machines would be available, TB reported that the procurement process was continuing with an expectation of an 18 month time period for their installation to commence.
- 3.1.16 The problems with verge parking were discussed, TB identified that legislation was required to enable enforcement, although any enforcement process would need to consider the subsequent possible impact of increased on-street parking, such as reducing the flow of traffic.

3.2 Richard Jones, N&E Area Service Manager, Hertfordshire Highways

- 3.2.1 Richard Jones (RJ) provided background papers for circulation prior to the meeting (Appendix C, not produced with this report available upon request).
- 3.2.2 RJ gave a short introduction referring to decriminalisation of parking in 2003, the Council's signing up to powers to introduce parking restrictions in 2005 and the County's wish to support District Councils.
- 3.2.3 RJ suggested that public awareness and understanding about the roles of the County and District Council could be enhanced by the production of joint literature identifying powers and duties. The group supported this recommendation (Recommendation 5.1.6)
- 3.2.4 RJ continued to explain that when considering parking restrictions the test is the avoidance of danger not just to facilitate passage. The funding should be accordance with a statutory requirement or a policy such as the 'Local Transport Plan' or 'Safe Routes to School'.
- 3.2.5 RJ confirmed that Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) can be introduced to restrict pavement parking. Stevenage was cited as an example where on-street parking was maximised before introducing restrictions.
- 3.2.6 Members discussed a comment within RJ's background papers, in that in certain locations it may desirable to promote verge or footway parking to facilitate on street parking. Concern was expressed as to controlling the adequacy of remaining pavement space and any potential costs around any need to strengthen verges and/or the need for on-going repairs. RJ informed the Group that whilst he had no direct experience of this option being implemented, he felt it was important to make the panel aware of the possibility. Members were grateful for the awareness of this potential option. HGV parking on verges was also discussed, RJ had within his background papers provided details of the legislation that the Council could use to control such parking. (Recommendation 5.1.8 and 5.1.9).
- 3.2.7 The process and cost of TRO's was discussed particularly the legal requirement to purchase advertising space within local newspapers. Members felt that the cost was not appropriate and that alternative solutions such as the internet should be permitted by Central Government (Recommendation 5.1.5).
- 3.2.8 The Panel asked whether 'damage only' accidents could be used in assessing the need for safety schemes. RJ advised that for safety engineering programmes only reportable injury accidents are used, however, for TRO's other evidence can be used. If damage only accident statistics are to be used then they would need to be supported by the police.
- 3.2.9 Members asked how perceptions of danger could be taken into account as local councillors felt for example with planning applications, that the engineers have arrived at a conclusion and will not consider local views. RJ confirmed that the County Council assess applications on a technical basis only.
- 3.2.10 Members asked for RJ's view as to North Herts approach to parking management as compared to other Hertfordshire authorities. RJ said that he could only make limited comment but felt that NHDC's parking strategy had re-energised activity.

3.3 Steve Crowley, NHDC Contracts and Project Manager

- 3.3.1 Steve Crowley (SC) gave an introduction to his teams structure and role.

- 3.3.2 SC was involved in the review of different payment methods for the car parks. Pay on foot was not considered suitable for any existing car parks, pay and display being the preferred option. Members asked whether the new machines would be able to allow the use of credit or debit cards. SC confirmed that this facility would be available but not to all machines. Members sought reassurance that each car park would have a machine with this facility. Simon Young confirmed that the intention was that each car park would be provided with a ticket machine capable of taking card payments. The location of machines could not be confirmed as some rationalisation was needed to ensure an appropriate number of machines and machine type dependant upon demand.
- 3.3.3 SC confirmed that sufficient signage would be provided within car parks to alert users to the location of particular machines, such as those able to take card payments.
- 3.3.4 Simon Young also confirmed following a Member question that the new machines would be supplied as, or be able to be upgraded to allow use of new 'wave and pay' or 'pay pass' cards.
- 3.3.5 Members asked whether the new ticket machines would be purchased with the necessary back office functions to allow the collection and analysis of data. SC confirmed that the connectivity would be available and the intention was that the back office systems would be included. It was noted that the phone payment system does not collect usage data.
- 3.3.6 The Panel asked whether NHDC had sufficient resources for the adequate enforcement of parking restrictions, was outsourcing a viable option. SC informed the Group that discussions had taken place with East Herts but no financial savings could currently be made by joining with East Herts. Members questioned whether shared services (public and private sectors) could be an option to explore again in the future (Recommendation 5.1.1), also could existing staff be approached to modify their existing working patterns. SC responded that this is currently being explored with the team.
- 3.3.7 A discussion on car parking enforcement followed in which it was noted that NHDC are aligning all car parking areas so that all are equitably enforced in line with the latest legislation.
- 3.4 **Simon Young, NHDC Transport Policy Officer**
- 3.4.1 Simon Young (SY) gave an overview of the costs associated with maintaining lines and signs so that appropriate enforcement can be undertaken.
- 3.4.2 SY also updated the Group with regard the introduction of Bank Holiday and evening parking charges, the increased usage month on month of the pay by phone function and an update on the Baldock Area Review. SY also reported that the arrangements between NHDC's transport team, planning, legal team and officers at County over the past 18 months had evolved into an excellent working relationship.
- 3.4.3 Members asked what lessons/good practise had been learnt from the Baldock Area Review. SY identified the difficulty of convincing all parking users that enforcement is beneficial and the need for residents to consider parking displacement into their areas when considering whether they wish to have parking restrictions. The consultation process was also identified by SY as being very resource intensive.
- 3.4.4 The Panel asked how the options that had been presented at consultation had been arrived at. SY confirmed that all the parking management options included 'do nothing', 'double yellow lines at junctions and narrow sections of road', 'single yellow lines between designated hours' and 'permit parking'. SY clarified that the initial

survey sought to assess the area under review, recording comments and opinions. By conducting the survey in this manner a clear picture of concerns and issues is developed. The consultations are conducted in an open and transparent manner and are not too detailed so as not to suggest that the presented options are a 'done deal' in the view of the residents. Residents can object however SY stated that where strong objection occurred the subsequent parking displacement in these streets often led to residents reconsidering. MM informed the Group that of the five areas consulted as part of the Baldock Area Wide Review, the majority of residents in only two areas responded positively to the concept of introducing parking management. However, it was the intention to publish TRO's for all 5 areas, should residents reconsider as this was a cheaper option than applying again for new TRO's (Recommendation 5.1.3).

3.4.5 Members noted that lessons learnt in Hitchin meant that a number of residents may not own cars but still require access to parking spaces for visitors such as Meals on Wheels and other social care providers. SY stated that the surveys were an opportunity for residents to inform the team of their requirements, some home help organisations had already secured parking permits.

3.5 Cllr Michael Muir, representative of the North Hertfordshire Highways Joint Member Panel

3.5.1 Cllr Michael Muir (MM) had attended for the day and began by acknowledging that RJ had covered most of the background information he intended to provide the panel within his presentation and background papers.

3.5.2 MM stated that it was likely that the Joint Member Panel (JMP) would cease to meet next year as part of a County wide change and this would save costs.

3.5.3 Members discussed funding from a number of sources (JMP, councillors own discretionary budgets, Area Committees) and that combined funding could be used to prioritise schemes.

3.5.4 MM informed the Group that Broxbourne and Dacorum Council's were entering into a trial period to work together on a joint parking strategy. MM will take on a watching brief and inform all other districts of the outcomes of this collaboration.

3.5.5 Concern was raised as to whether the loss of the JMP could lead to a loss of a strategic overview. It was felt that as County Councillors can be invited to report to Area Committees by the Chair, the strategic overview of parking management schemes and priorities could be maintained.

3.6 Andrew Pulham, Parking Manager, East Hertfordshire District Council

3.6.1 Andrew Pulham (AP) gave a short introduction informing the Group that East and North Herts share similar characteristics and were suitable for comparison. East Herts is currently working to produce its own parking strategy.

3.6.2 East Herts has 26 pay and display car parks as well as administering and enforcing schemes for Stevenage and Welwyn Hatfield. Broxbourne are considering joining this arrangement. AP informed the Panel that tender documentation had been issued for outside contractors to administer the back office functions.

3.6.3 The panel asked whether the enforcement function had been tendered out at East Herts, whether targets had been set and how out-of-hours parking enforcement was undertaken.

3.6.4 AP confirmed that the enforcement function had not been tendered to outside organisations and no 'quantity' targets were set only qualitative targets. AP

acknowledged that out-of-hours enforcement was expensive so East Herts only undertook a random checking process.

- 3.6.5 Members asked whether the out-of-hours enforcement was written into the Civil Enforcement Officers contracts and was classed as overtime. AP stated that the additional enforcement was written in contracts.
- 3.6.6 Clarity was sought about the provision of 'Lorry Bans', AP clarified that the ban occurs in Stevenage and additional officers had been employed to enforce.
- 3.6.7 AP stated that Welwyn Hatfield had Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's) whereas Stevenage did not. The Panel ask the costs of the permits, AP believed they were £34/annum rising to £68 in April. He noted that these were not a revenue generator and alternative funding streams were used to support the schemes (Recommendation 5.1.4).
- 3.6.8 A question was raised regarding the setting of policy for enforcement and the areas that were to be enforced. AP stated that the officers were tasked with identifying areas for enforcement with support from the Members. Policy and operational decisions were the responsibility of the Contracts and Project Mangers together with the Transport Policy Officer. Any decisions were based upon the relevant plans and strategies.
- 3.6.9 Members asked how the balance between providing car parking, the climate strategy and encouraging the vibrancy of town centres is managed. AP noted that this was not an easy balancing act to achieve.
- 3.6.10 AP was asked how the issue of displacement from CPZ's had been considered, AP confirmed that East Herts approached this through a considered design, engineering the time taken to travel by foot, ensuring the initial consultation is sufficiently wide and reviewing after 6 months.
- 3.6.11 Members asked how the car park tariffs were applied, AP confirmed that different charges were made between differing car parks (short and long stay), Bishop Stortford and Hertford had similar tariffs, whereas the villages and Ware had lower tariffs.
- 3.6.12 The Chair thanked Andrew for his participation, the Group found it very useful to be able to make comparisons with a similar district.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 The Group agreed three conclusions following scrutiny of the implementation of the Council's parking strategy, these being:
 - 4.1.1 That the car parking strategy as a document is robust and emerged well from the scrutiny process and overall is being implemented well
 - 4.1.2 The particular importance of Policies 18 and 22 is supported; "that being the principle of supporting residents and/or local businesses in preference to longer stay non-residential or [non-] local business parking"
 - 4.1.3 That, apart from the availability of resources, the major problem in implementing on-street schemes is displacement, and the difficulty of persuading residents currently unaffected that displacement will affect them if they are not incorporated
- 4.2 The one-day timescale for Task and Finish Groups had not been used before, as such the format was also reviewed and a conclusion drawn, this being:
 - 4.2.1 That the one-day format for the scrutiny process was successful particularly as it allowed the topic to develop throughout the day, themes could be linked, issues were not lost and witnesses were able to stay for the entire process. However, reservations were raised as to the suitability of this shorter process for all topics and that due to the scheduling of an all day meeting this specific approach may exclude some Members who work from participating

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 The Group identified a number of recommendations following the scrutiny process, these being:
- 5.1.1 That work on shared service options for the implementation of the car parking strategy be continued, in particular regarding TRO notices and enforcement
 - 5.1.2 That the holistic area based approach, when tailored to fit local circumstances and incorporate several options, for Area Parking Reviews be endorsed and should continue
 - 5.1.3 That an appropriate review process is included within Area Parking Reviews to allow amendment of zones following initial implementation
 - 5.1.4 That alternative funding streams be pursued as a means to support the implementation of the car parking strategy
 - 5.1.5 That NHDC support through the appropriate channels those seeking to persuade Central Government to reduce and relax the publicity requirement for publishing Notices in the press relating to Traffic Regulation Orders due to the cost
 - 5.1.6 That information/literature for the general public is produced jointly with HCC in order to further explain the process of Road Traffic Orders and the roles and powers of the County and District Councils
 - 5.1.7 That the Portfolio Holder be supported with regard to the possible sale of on street car parking permits to other parties (e.g. commuters), whilst ensuring that these do not have a detrimental impact upon the controlled residents parking zones in conjunction with Policy 18 and Policy 22
 - 5.1.8 That the Portfolio Holder be supported with regard to the aim to enforce against inappropriate parking of cars and light vans on footways and verges subject to a business case
 - 5.1.9 That enforcement action to prevent the parking of Heavy Goods Vehicles on footways and verges under Section 19 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 be supported
 - 5.1.10 That the forthcoming Supplementary Planning Document, Vehicle Parking Provision for New Developments, be included as part of the review process for policies following the implementation of the 'Localism Act'
 - 5.1.11 That solutions be explored and implemented as soon as practicable to provide at appropriate locations real-time information for motorists about spaces available in off-street car parks subject to adequate budget provision

Appendix A
North Hertfordshire District Council
SCOPE FOR THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARKING STRATEGY
Scrutiny Task and Finish Group

Introduction

Parking is an important issue that affects the majority of North Hertfordshire's residents and businesses. Demand for parking is increasing and competition for parking spaces will intensify, especially as the district will be affected by future housing growth.

The Council's approach to parking issues in North Hertfordshire is set out in a ten year strategy and action plan. The strategy covers all aspects of parking, including on-street, off-street (both charged for and free), town centres, residential areas, parking for blue badge holders and, in general, the management and enforcement of parking in the District.

The Council has an agreement with Hertfordshire County Council that permits it to initiate, implement and enforce waiting restrictions on the highway where these relate to the provision of parking. Parking controls that are required for safety reasons remain the responsibility of the County Council to implement and the District Council to enforce.

Terms of reference

To investigate and review the efficacy of North Hertfordshire's Parking Strategy with particular reference to the provision of parking and the use of area wide reviews.

Expected Outcomes

1. To assess the fee charging structure for parking in North Hertfordshire
2. To identify information requirements that will assist in managing parking demand and supply
3. To ascertain whether the first area wide review process in Baldock has worked acceptably and what, if any, changes should be made for future reviews
4. To make recommendations for future improvements to the Council's Parking Strategy when it is reviewed

Timeframe

May/June 2011

Link with Council Priorities

This review relates to two of the Council's three priorities

- Town Centres, particularly
 - o Addressing challenges in relation to parking
 - o Effectively managing the use and development of council buildings and assets
- Sustainable Development, particularly
 - o Working with our partners to enhance and improve local transport and other infrastructure

Potential witnesses

Cllr. Thomas Brindley, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Transport and Economic Development
Cllr. Michael Muir, Hertfordshire Highways Partnership and the Joint Member Panel
Simon Young, NHDC Transport Policy Officer
Steve Crowley, NHDC Contracts and Project Manager

Andrew Pulham, Parking Manager at East Herts District Council
Richard Jones, Hertfordshire Highways Area Manager.....

Key Questions

- Are there adequate parking facilities in North Hertfordshire?
- Are the costs of parking reasonable for the Council and users and are they competitive with surrounding parking facilities?
- What is the process for the area wide reviews – has this been effective and what do we need to change for the future?
- What parking data do we need to effectively manage supply and demand? To what extent can that data be reasonably collected?
- Are rural parking issues being effectively addressed?

Information documents

- Baldock Area Parking Review
- Hitchin Area Parking Review
- North Hertfordshire District Council Parking Strategy 2009 – 2019
- North Hertfordshire District Council Parking Strategy 2009 – 2019 Action Plan
- Hitchin Urban Transport Plan
- Letchworth and Baldock Urban Transport Plan
- Royston Urban Transport Plan
- Local Transport Plan 2 (LTP3 is due in April 2011)
- Parish Plans

Membership

Cllr Richard Thake (Chair)
Cllr Clare Body
(*substitute: Cllr Paul Clark*)

Cllr David Billing (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Bill Davidson
(*substitute: Cllr Michael Paterson*)

Cllr Paul Marment

Portfolio Holder

Cllr Thomas Brindley – Planning, Transport and Economic Development

Lead Officer

Ian Fullstone, Head of Development and Building Control

Support Officer (s)

TBC

(Agreed 3 April 2011)

Appendix B
Programme for the Scrutiny Event

TIME	QUESTIONS	WITNESS
10.00 (items 1-4)	Welcome and administration	
10.30 (item 5)	<p><i>What are the key factors motivating the Parking Strategy?</i></p> <p><i>How was the fee charging system for off-street parking approached?</i></p> <p><i>What are the key operational and management challenges of on-street parking?</i></p>	<p>Cllr Tom Brindley Portfolio Holder for Planning Transport and Economic Development</p>
11.15	Refreshments	
11.30	<p><i>What are the roles and responsibilities of the District and the County?</i></p> <p><i>How are requests from the public dealt with in the different areas?</i></p> <p><i>What is the contrast between this local authority and others' parking operations and management?</i></p>	<p>Richard Jones Herts Highways Area Manager</p>
12.15	Pre-lunch sum up	
12.30	Lunch	
13.15	<p><i>What lessons have been learnt in the last 18 months since the implementation of the Parking Strategy?</i></p> <p><i>What were the outcomes of the Baldock area review and how did you act upon them?</i></p> <p><i>What are the emerging parking issues in North Hertfordshire?</i></p>	<p>Steve Crowley Contracts & Project Manager</p> <p>Simon Young Transport Policy Officer</p>
13.45	<p><i>How does the Joint Member Panel operate?</i></p> <p><i>What are the District's and County's parking priorities?</i></p>	<p>Cllr Michael Muir Representative of North Hertfordshire Highways Joint Member Panel</p>
14.15	Refreshments	
14.30	<p><i>What are the information data requirements for assisting in managing parking demand and supply?</i></p> <p><i>What is the availability of this information?</i></p> <p><i>How is on and off street parking managed in East Herts?</i></p>	<p>Andrew Pulham Parking Manager at East Herts District Council</p>
15.00 (item 6)	Conclusions and recommendations	
16.00	Close	

Appendix C

Statements

Richard Jones, N&E Area Service Manager for Hertfordshire Highways, provided background papers in advance of the meeting (available upon request).