



DERBY CITY COUNCIL

**PLANNING, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT  
INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER MEETING  
16 JULY 2007**

**ITEM 7**

Report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Community

**Proposed Residents Parking Scheme Kings Drive Area**

**SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report is prepared in order to provide background information to the Cabinet Member regarding this scheme and for the member to make a number of decisions regarding the next stage of the scheme.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 To progress the scheme as detailed in drawing no TMD/105/07 (which will be available at the meeting) including the following alterations to the scheme as a result of the consultation:
- Removal of the zig zags outside the school to be replaced by double yellow lines
  - Amendments to the carriageway markings in Springfield and Elms Drive as discussed with the residents
- 2.2 It is also recommended not to issue permits to any school staff members, but to allow the school the ability to purchase a number of visitor permits per year to cover events held during the hours of operation of the scheme.
- 2.3 Cabinet member to make a decision on the hours of operation of the residents parking area.
- 2.4 To formally consult ward councillors on the proposals.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 In order to progress the residents parking scheme in accordance with residents wishes.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 1.2 As part of the new super hospital on the Derby City General Hospital site, funding was secured during the planning process to mitigate the effects of any on street parking arising as a result of the development. Some of this funding has been used to carry out a number of traffic surveys to record the changing patterns of parking as the Hospital expands. In addition works have been carried out to introduce traffic calming with the intention of making the residential roads less attractive to through traffic and so to preserve the qualities of the area for those who live there.
- 1.3 During consultation in the Kings Drive area there has been much support for a residents' only parking restriction. In January this year we consulted all residents of Kings Drive, Jackson Avenue, Elms Avenue, Elms Drive and Springfield on proposals to introduce a residents' parking scheme. The results were as follows:
- 294 questionnaires were sent out
  - 226 households responded – (77% of all households)
  - 217 were in favour - 96% of those that responded (74% of all households)

The proposed 8am to 6pm hours of operation (seven days a week) received the most support with 57% of those responding supporting these hours. Where people expressed a preference for different times, the second most popular was 8am to 8pm with 25% of the vote.

- 1.4 Because of the level of support for the scheme, a further leaflet was sent to residents at the end of April explaining that the scheme was being progressed, giving further details of the scheme and an invitation to a drop in session arranged for 2<sup>nd</sup> May at Wren Park School to discuss the various options for marking out the off street parking.
- 1.5 Following concerns from residents a site visit was carried out in Springfield. On the leaflet it had been suggested that parking would be restricted on one side of the street by a single yellow line. It became clear that residents who attended the meeting were not in favour of this option. A way forward was proposed for Springfield which would limit the amount of signing, and lining required whilst maintaining the current parking arrangements for residents. A similar concern was raised by residents in Elms Drive about the proposals to introduce a single yellow line on one side of the street and a similar solution has been recommended.
- 1.6 The meeting at Wren Park Primary School was very well attended with 47 forms returned on the day and with many more people attending the session to ask questions.

1.7 Results from the returned leaflets were as follows:

- 294 leaflets were sent out.
- 203 households responded – 69% of all households
- 199 were in favour - 98% of those that responded (68% of all households).

It is worth pointing out that although the question wasn't asked 77 households made reference to extending the hours of operation. Throughout the consultation concern has been raised regarding the hours of operation.

- 1.8 The Head teacher at Wren Park Primary School raised a number of concerns primarily about the safety of children, but also about parking for staff and how it will impact on parents visiting the school for events such as sports days and parents evenings. As part of the introduction of the residents parking scheme it is recommended that the current advisory school zig zag markings (55m long) are removed. To be replaced by double yellows restricted to a length of 45m to cover the entrance and adjacent driveways therefore providing some opportunity for coaches to drop off and pick up. It is proposed not to offer any parking permits to cover the schools midday supervisors, as this would seem contrary to any of our policies, as they are not essential vehicles for the purpose of a business. The hours of operation of the scheme were initially chosen in order to limit any adverse effects on other users in the area such as the school. Whilst it is acceptable to allow parents to drop off /pick up their children from school, as there is a general exemption for loading and unloading in the resident only bays, it is recommended that the school is able to purchase a fixed number of permits each year to cover events held during the hours of operation of the scheme.
- 1.9 It will be necessary to carry out further consultation with ward councillors before progressing this scheme (this would form part of the process to take forward the introduction of a traffic regulation order).
- 1.10 It is recommended that we undertake a public consultation process as part of the traffic regulation order process including a display of the proposed scheme to be held at the school allowing interested parties to see the final design and the ability to formally object if necessary.
- 1.11 In the consultation there has been some concern regarding the proposed hours of operation and in particular the wish to extend it to 8pm. In the consultations carried out:
- first consultation - 57% supported the proposed, 8 am to 6 pm, scheme hours of operation, with 25% recommending 8am to 8pm
  - second consultation – 199 were in favour of the scheme with 77 (39%) making reference to extending the hours.

1.12 Your views would be appreciated as to the possible hours of operation of the residents parking scheme. In summary:

8am – 8pm

- evening visitors to the residential area would have to have visitor permits;
- the restriction would cover the evening visiting times at the hospital (6pm-8pm);
- school visitors would have to arrange for a visitor permit for any event up to 8pm;

8am – 6pm

- evening visitors to the residential area would not need to have visitor permits;
- the restriction would not cover the evening visiting times at the hospital (6pm-8pm);
- school visitors would not have to arrange for a visitor permit for any event after 6pm;

<p><b>For more information contact:</b> Tim Banton Tel. 01332 715026 e-mail <a href="mailto:tim.banton@derby.gov.uk">tim.banton@derby.gov.uk</a></p> <p><b>Background papers:</b> HospitalTrust Car parking Policy, Consultation documents, parking surveys</p> <p><b>List of appendices:</b></p>
---

**IMPLICATIONS****Financial**

1. £300,000 from S106 index linked to April 2000

Section 106 funds have already been utilised for street lighting improvements, staff costs, implementation of traffic calming and parking surveys. It is suggested that the remaining section 106 funds would cover the implementation and operation of the scheme for the first two years:

- Staff costs, consultation, scheme design, supervision - £30,000
- Residents parking scheme implementation - £20,000
- Traffic Regulation Order costs - £5,000
- Enforcement costs for 2 years – £80,000
- Approximate administration costs for 2 years - £35,000

**Legal**

1. The statutory legal process of introducing a traffic regulation order would need to be followed.

**Personnel**

1. None.

**Equalities impact**

4. None.

**Corporate Priorities**

5. None.