

Worthing Parking Review – Decision Report

Worthing County Local Committee

5 March 2015

Worthing Parking Review

Report by Director of Highways and Transport & Service
Manager for Residents & Environmental Services

Ref:
W13(14/15)

Key Decision:
Yes

Part I

Electoral
Division(s):
Broadwater
Worthing East

Executive Summary

The Worthing County Local Committee (CLC) is asked to make a decision on the next steps for changes to parking in parts of Broadwater and East Worthing.

A consultation took place during December 2014 and January 2015 with residents, businesses and stakeholders. Proposals for an extended Residents' Parking Scheme in East Worthing were advertised, alongside proposals for additional yellow line restrictions in Broadwater and a small number of other changes within the existing parking scheme. The consultation included the erection of lamppost signs in all affected roads and a direct mailing to residents in East Worthing.

Overall, there was a 29% response rate to the consultation in East Worthing. Of these, 36% were in support of the proposals, 22% were in support subject to changes being made and 41% objected. A number of comments and suggestions were received from residents in other roads which could lead to a number of changes being incorporated into the proposals.

Officers are of the view that the proposals in both Broadwater and East Worthing, incorporating some changes, should progress to the next stage of design and formal consultation.

Recommendations

That the Worthing CLC authorise the Head of Law and Governance to formally advertise modified proposals, as described by Option 1, and subject to there being no objections after a formal advertisement, bring the Traffic Regulation Order into operation.

1. Background

- 1.1 This report presents the results of a recent consultation into changing parking restrictions in parts of Worthing. The proposals included extending the Residents' Parking Scheme (RPS) in East Worthing, alongside proposals for additional yellow line restrictions in Broadwater and a small number of other changes within the existing RPS.

- 1.2 The RPS in Worthing has been in place since 1996 and in recent years a number of concerns from residents in unrestricted roads on the periphery of the scheme have been raised with the County Council. These relate mainly to the increase in all day parking by non-residents, who are seemingly unable or unwilling to use off-street or private car parks. This has reduced the availability of parking for residents, affected access, reduced visibility and has been detrimental to road safety.
- 1.3 In response to this, officers in the Parking Strategy Team have appointed a parking consultant to undertake a comprehensive review of the parking arrangements in East Worthing and Broadwater. In October 2013, an initial survey into parking issues suggested support from residents in both areas for the County Council to start design work and then proceed with an informal consultation. A consultation subsequently took place during December 2014 and January 2015.
- 1.4 The Worthing County Local Committee (CLC) is asked to consider the results of the consultation and make a decision on the next steps for changes to parking in East Worthing and Broadwater.

2. Proposals

- 2.1 The proposals were formed of three main parts:
 - 1) Extension of the RPS in a number of roads in East Worthing. This means that only residents and their visitors would be able to park at certain times of the day through the display of a permit.
 - 2) Adding double yellow lines in various roads in Broadwater in order to improve access, safety and visibility.
 - 3) Minor changes to the waiting restrictions in some roads within the existing RPS in order to improve it's overall operation.
- 2.2 Full details of the proposals that formed part of the informal consultation can be seen in [Appendix A](#).

3. Consultation

- 3.1 An initial survey was carried out in East Worthing and Broadwater in October 2013 to establish whether residents were having problems with parking and whether they would like WSCC to consider potential solutions. The results of the survey indicated that there was support from residents in both areas for the County Council to start design work and then proceed with an informal consultation.
- 3.2 An informal consultation on the proposals took place during December 2014 and January 2015 with residents and businesses through a number of channels including direct mailing (in East Worthing) and lamppost signs in all affected roads that outlined how to view the proposals online and make comments. In addition, hard copies of the proposals were made available for viewing at Worthing Borough Council Offices.
- 3.3 A number of partner organisations were also consulted via e-mail, including Worthing Borough Council, NSL Services, Worthing Chamber of Commerce,

Federation of Small Businesses, Public Transport Operators, Resident Associations, Sussex Police, Fire and Rescue Service, Freight Transport Association, Road Haulage Association as well as other Age and Disability/Access groups.

- 3.4 993 consultation packs were sent out to residents and businesses in East Worthing and 291 responses were received, a response rate of 29%. Of these, 36% were in support of the proposals, 22% were in support but with changes and 41% objected. A number of comments and suggestions were received from residents in other roads. A report outlining the consultation responses from both areas, as well as a commentary from officers (including recommendations) can be found in [Appendix B](#).

- 3.5 Members of the CLC are asked to consider the following options:

Option 1

To formally advertise the revised proposals for Broadwater and East Worthing, as outlined in the officer recommendations in Appendix B. This includes the option to include or drop the proposals for particular roads in East Worthing e.g. Ham Way

Option 2

To formally advertise the revised proposals but without including the RPS in East Worthing. Whilst this option could prolong the issues of all-day commuter parking in parts of East Worthing, it would respond to those residents that did not support the proposals and would also enable officers to discuss alternative options with councillors and other stakeholder groups.

Option 3

Proceed no further with any proposals. If councillors feel there is not sufficient support or need for any of the proposals there is the option to go no further.

- 3.7 Option 1 is the preferred option of officers. Any other options that are significantly different to either Option 1 or 2 would need to go back to the informal consultation stage, rather than progressing to formal consultation. Members should be aware that this could add a further 6 months (at least) to the work programme.

4. **Equality Impact Report**

- 4.1 An Equality Impact Report has been undertaken and is attached as [Appendix C](#).
- 4.2 Councillors should be aware that the Equality Act 2010 bans unfair treatment and seeks equal opportunities in the workplace and in wider society. It also imposes a Public Sector Duty. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

5. Resource Implications and Value for Money

- 5.1 The enforcement costs for this type of scheme would be met by income from Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs), the sale of permits as well as Pay and Display. As such, the parking scheme (if implemented) would be self-financing.
- 5.2 The total scheme budget (incorporating design, consultation and implementation costs) is £40,000 over the financial year 2014/15. This comes from the County Council's On-Street Parking Account.
- 5.3 Policies to manage the demand for car use through the control of on-street parking tie in with County Council Policies. These include the Integrated Parking Strategy. Managing the demand for car use and parking also supports measures to tackle congestion and pollution, improve alternative modes of transport, particularly public transport, and improve road safety and residential amenity.

6. Risk Management Implications

- 6.1 The risk with not proceeding with a RPS for East Worthing as well as the other proposed changes is resident dissatisfaction. A large number of residents have indicated that the parking situation in these areas is getting more difficult and that they would like the County Council to take action. There is also a significant risk that cases of inconsiderate or dangerous parking could increase.
- 6.2 The risk with proceeding is that some residents and businesses find the proposals unacceptable. 41% of respondents objected to the proposed scheme in East Worthing. However, many of those who objected also included comments in their consultation response detailing the aspects they found unacceptable. These have been taken into account when preparing the amended proposals. It is therefore felt that the level of objection would be reduced in a future consultation. Pending approval, it is envisaged that a formal advertisement of traffic orders would take place later in 2015, offering residents, businesses and stakeholders a further opportunity to comment.

7. Crime and Disorder Act Implications

- 7.1 The County Council does not consider the scheme to create any crime and disorder issues. Officers have consulted with Sussex Police, who share this view. It is considered this will not change if implementation takes place.

8. Human Rights Act Implications

- 8.1 There are not considered to be any Human Rights Act Implications.

Nicola Debnam
Director
Highways & Transport

Andy Ekinsmyth
Transport Commissioning Manager
Transport and Countryside Services

Appendices

1. [Worthing Parking Review Proposals](#)
2. [Consultation responses and officer commentary/recommendations](#)
3. [Equality Impact Report](#)

Background Papers

None

Contact: Miles Davy, Lead Professional, Parking Strategy, 033022 26688.