

# North Tyneside Council Report to Council Date: 26 January 2011

## ITEM 6

Title: Petition – Parking  
in Tynemouth

Portfolio(s): Elected Mayor

Cabinet Member(s): Mrs Linda Arkley

Report from Directorate: Chief Executive's Office

Report Author: Ken Wilson, Head of Regeneration,  
Development and Regulatory Services (Tel: 643 6091)

Wards affected: Tynemouth

### PART 1

#### 1.1 Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to respond to Council's request, at its meeting of 24 November 2011, that officers examine the viability of objectives proposed in a petition by the Tynemouth Business Forum to the Council.

#### 1.2 Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that Council:

- i. note the information in the report regarding the viability of the petition's objectives;
- ii. note progress regarding other initiatives as set out in section 1.5.3; and
- iii. continue dialogue with Tynemouth Business Forum concerning parking initiatives and carry out continued monitoring of parking demand.

#### 1.3 Forward plan:

This matter has been included on the Forward Plan for the period 1 January 2012 – 30 April 2012.

#### 1.4 Council plan and policy framework:

The substance of the petition is relevant to proposals in the Draft Parking Strategy 2011-15, which is currently undergoing public consultation: the public consultation exercise was approved by Cabinet at its meeting of 12 September 2011.

## 1.5 Information:

At its meeting of 24 November 2011, Council considered a petition in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Petition Scheme contained in Part 5 of the Constitution.

The following actions were agreed by Council:

"Officers continue their ongoing dialogue with the Tynemouth Business Forum and other stakeholders in Tynemouth Village to identify further opportunities and initiatives to deal with the parking demand in the area including an option about the viability of the petition objectives" [to allow non residents into both parking zones TM1 and TM2 recently converted to residents permit parking, between 9.30 am and 4.30 pm] "and report back to the next Council meeting. Furthermore a report [be submitted] to the Cabinet toward setting in place the legal mechanisms for introducing said objectives."

### 1.5.1 Viability of the Petition Objectives

The petition requests that the 'residents only' parking zones known as TM1 and TM2 should be made available to all motorists between the hours of 09.30 and 16.30, 7 days a week. At present the TM2 'residents only' zone applies only on Saturdays and Sundays, when demand for parking by residents is highest; parking in this zone is free for visitors from Monday to Friday.

In order to make the 'residents only' zones into shared parking areas for visitors, as suggested by the petition, the Council would have to introduce amendments to the existing parking orders. These orders would have to be legally advertised and would be likely to attract a considerable number of objections from residents.

Council policy regarding shared parking schemes is to introduce parking charges for non-residents with exemptions for permit holders. If such a scheme was introduced into the TM1 and TM2 zones, considerable additional signage and road markings would be required, as well as an estimated 20 new ticket machines, with a total estimated cost of around £80,000 to carry out the works.

In order to further assess the viability of providing extra parking in the 'residents only' zones a number of detailed parking surveys were carried out to assess visitor parking demand.

### 1.5.2 Survey Results

In December, during the approach to Christmas 2011, a number of car parking surveys were carried out in Tynemouth Village. The surveys, carried out on 8-10 December, covered a Thursday, Friday and Saturday and examined capacity at 10.00 am, 12.00 midday and 3.00 pm (further details are in Appendix 1).

The aims of the surveys were to assess whether spaces were available on Front Street throughout the day; and to determine whether visitor parking capacity was available within 200 metres walking distance of Front Street (e.g. the Sea Banks facility and Percy Park Road.) The surveys would also look at the available spaces in both of the 'residents only' zones during the week and at weekends.

Weekday occupancy of the Front Street facility varied between 55% at midday (with 37 spaces available) on Thursday to a maximum of 91% (with 8 spaces available) on Friday

at 3.00 pm. During the same period, as suggested in the petition, there was an average of 96 spaces available in the 9 streets within TM1. At all times, however, there was availability on Front Street and throughout the unrestricted TM2 zone (typically over 100 spaces available on a weekday: see Table 4 in Appendix 1).

On the Saturday, Front Street was much busier after midday with only limited spaces available; however, this coincided with much higher occupancy of the streets in TM1, the 'residents only' zone. Significantly, there were still between 24 and 29 free spaces available on Percy Park Road and typically over 50 spaces on Sea Banks (see Table 6 in Appendix 1).

The second set of surveys were carried out on 15-17 December, once again over a Thursday, Friday and Saturday. These surveys concentrated on the TM2 zone, which is available to all users during the week, as well as looking at the Sea Banks facility which is available for visitor parking.

During the week there were a considerable number of on-street parking spaces available in the TM2 zone, with over 110 spaces available during all periods. At the same time both Percy Park Road (30 spaces) and the Sea Banks facility (80 spaces) had considerable capacity available. As in TM1, the number of available spaces in the streets of TM2 decreased substantially at weekends; however, both facilities on the periphery of the zone, at Sea Banks and Percy Park Road, had considerable spare capacity on the Saturdays surveyed.

### 1.5.3 Progress regarding other initiatives

Traffic orders were recently advertised, to reduce the maximum stay on Front Street in Tynemouth from 4 hours to 2 hours, and as no objections were received, the changes will be implemented from 9 January 2012. This is expected to further increase the turnover of spaces and support retail vitality. The introduction of a loading bay on Hotspur Street for use by the bakery and other businesses, as well as the relocation of the disabled bays onto Front Street, will also proceed in January 2012 as these have completed the necessary statutory procedure.

Improvements to signing of parking, and the clarity of signing, have been carried out and it is planned to produce a leaflet showing details of accessibility and parking for visitors.

The previous report informed Council of the dialogue which had taken place with two of the schools in the area regarding the potential to provide extra parking capacity at weekends when demand is highest. King's School were prepared to offer 30-40 spaces only if these were preferably reserved for named permit holders and protected by an automatic fob security system. Priory School sought similar measures and had 10 spaces available. Investigations of the cost of similar security systems in use by Council officers suggested that the costs involved would be prohibitive (ca. £10,000) and it is by no means certain that permit holders would make use of the school sites in preference to other parking areas.

Officers have also considered options for reorganising the parking bays on Percy Park Road to increase the number of spaces and a draft scheme has now been designed which would provide a further 15 to 20 spaces, subject to discussion with Ward Members and residents.

## **1.6 Procedure**

The Council's Petition Scheme forms part of the Council's Constitution and reflects the requirements of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. The petition received had in excess of 3,000 signatures and pursuant to the Scheme was reported to full Council at its meeting of 24 November 2011.

Under the Council's Petition Scheme the petition organisers were given five minutes to present the petition at the Council meeting and then the petition was discussed by the Councillors for 15 minutes. The recommendations were accepted by Council with an amendment to commission further investigation regarding the viability of the petition's objectives.

## **1.7 Decision options:**

Council may:

1. Accept the recommendations outlined in section 1.2
2. Not accept the recommendations for reasons put forward in the debate.

Option 1 is the recommended option.

## **1.8 Reasons for recommended option:**

As demonstrated by the survey results set out in Tables 1 to 6 in Appendix 1, there are substantial numbers of available spaces for visitors throughout Tynemouth Village during the week, either on Front Street or within 200 metres' walking distance of Front Street. The demand is greater at weekends and may be greater still on certain summer weekends, however considerable numbers of spaces were found to be available on Percy Park Road and on the Sea Banks facility all within easy walking distance.

There is little support from residents in either of the 'residents only' parking zones for a shared use scheme, as indicated by the survey quoted in the November 2011 report, and both of these areas have few parking spaces available at weekends. There have also been letters in the local press opposing any change to the original scheme and it is understood that Ward Members have received similar correspondence from residents.

To carry out the amendment to the scheme as requested in the petition would require a new scheme to be designed and advertised, including amendments to the existing order. The proposals would have to be formally advertised and it is likely that a considerable number of objections would be received from residents. The costs of any such scheme would also be considerable (ca.£80,000).

## **1.9 Appendices:**

Appendix 1: Table 1 Tynemouth Parking survey Thursday 8 December 2011  
Table 2 Tynemouth Parking survey Friday 9 December 2011  
Table 3 Tynemouth Parking survey Saturday 10 December 2011  
Table 4 Tynemouth Parking survey Thursday 15 December 2011  
Table 5 Tynemouth Parking survey Friday 16 December 2011  
Table 6 Tynemouth Parking survey Saturday 17 December 2011

## **1.10 Contact officers:**

Derek Smith, Senior Manager, Regeneration, Development and Regulatory Services,  
Tel. (0191) 643 6106  
Kevin Ridpath, Network and Transportation Manager, Tel. (0191) 643 6089  
Alison Campbell, Financial Business Manager, Tel. (0191) 643 7038

## **1.11 Background information:**

Petition received on 3 November 2011, copies of which are available for inspection at the office of the Head of Legal, Governance and Commercial Services, in the Group rooms in Quadrant East and on the Council's website.

Report to Council, Petition - Parking in Tynemouth, 24 November 2011

A plan of the Tynemouth parking scheme (first phase introduced in April 2011 and second phase during September 2011) will be made available at the meeting.

## **PART 2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF DECISION MAKING**

### **2.1 Finance and other resources**

The Tynemouth parking scheme and subsequent amendments to the scheme were funded from the Council's Local Transport Plan allocation. Any proposed further small-scale alterations would be considered for funding from future Local Transport Plan allocations. Any costs not able to be funded from the Local Transport Plan will be reported back to Council for a decision.

### **2.2 Legal**

The Council's Petition Scheme forms a part of the Council's Constitution and reflects the requirements of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. The petition received triggered the relevant provisions of the Council's Scheme and received consideration by Council at its meeting of 24 November 2011.

### **2.3 Consultation/community engagement**

The scheme which is now in place was subject to considerable consultation, including through the relevant statutory processes. This is described in the report 'Petition – Parking in Tynemouth', considered by Council at its meeting of 24 November 2011.

### **2.4 Human rights**

There are no human rights implications directly arising from this report.

### **2.5 Equalities and diversity**

There are no equalities and diversity implications directly arising from this report.

### **2.6 Risk management**

There are no risk implications immediately identifiable. Should any risks arise these will be addressed through the relevant corporate risk processes.

## 2.7 Crime and disorder

There are no crime and disorder implications directly arising from this report.

## 2.8 Environment and sustainability

The initial scheme sought to promote public transport and deter long term parking whilst encouraging short term visits to promote retail vitality.

### PART 3 - SIGN OFF

- Strategic Director(s)  X
- Mayor/Cabinet Member(s)  X
- Chief Finance Officer  X
- Monitoring Officer  X
- Strategic Director with responsibility for Community Engagement  X