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1. Executive Summary

1.1. Context/Background

1.1.1. Following a number of comments and requests from local residents and Ladywood Ward Members, Birmingham City Council (BCC) commissioned Atkins to undertake a review of the parking controls in the St. Marks area of Ladywood, through a consultation with local residents and businesses within the review area shown in Figure 2.1.

1.2. Methodology

1.2.1. A Stage 1 consultation was carried out, whereby consultation leaflets and a questionnaire was hand delivered to all residential and business properties in the review area requesting responses to the questionnaire to be returned by 5th April 2013. The response deadline was subsequently extended to 19th April 2013, due to some concerns about the deliveries.

1.2.2. Responses could be made by completing and returning the ‘hard copy’ of the questionnaire or by completing the questionnaire on-line.

1.2.3. Details of the consultation and a link to the on-line questionnaire were made available on the BCC website at www.birmingham.gov.uk/stmarksparking and posters were displayed on-street across the review area.

1.2.4. If anyone had any queries or concerns about the consultation they could telephone or email the consultation team.

1.3. Summary of consultation analysis

1.3.1. Table 1.1 summarises the analysis of the consultation returns and the responses to each of the questions in the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many people aged 17+ live at your address?</td>
<td>The average number of people (aged over 17 years) per household of those who responded was 1.8 with the majority of the respondents stating that two people (aged over 17 years) lives in their household, followed by properties with two people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many vehicles are there in your household?</td>
<td>The results showed that the average number of vehicles per property of those who responded was 1.2 with the majority of the respondents having one vehicle at their address, followed by properties with two vehicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Do you think that there is a parking problem on your street?  
   The majority of respondents believe that there is a parking problem in the St. Marks area with 87% of responses. Less than 60% of respondents from one street (St. Marks Street) felt there was a parking problem. It is anticipated that if controls were only implemented on certain streets in St. Marks, parking problems would significantly increase on uncontrolled streets due to the displacement of vehicles.

4. If yes to Q3, do you think any of the following contribute to the problem?  
   From the results of Question 4, it is clear that vehicles are being parked to access destinations outside of the St. Marks area and that the level of parking in the area is causing concerns over safety. The survey results highlight commuters, local workers, visitors and shoppers as being the main contributors to the parking problem.

5. Do you think there is a parking problem in the proposal area which impact on your business?  
   No businesses responded.

6. If yes to Q5, do you think any of the following contribute to the problem?  
   No businesses responded.

7. If parking controls were introduced, which days of the week do you think would be most appropriate for controls to apply?  
   A majority of 56% of respondents indicated that controls operating Monday to Friday would be most appropriate followed by 22% who stated that controls operating seven days a week would be most appropriate and 17% favoured controls operating Monday to Saturday.

8. If parking controls were introduced, what would be the most operating hours?  
   Outside of these hours the restrictions would not reply.  
   A majority of 57% of respondents indicated that controls operating all day would be most appropriate, followed by 17% stating that controls operating in the day and evenings would be most appropriate.

9. Would you be in favour of a permit holders scheme for the St Marks Estate  
   Please note there would be a charge for permits – see information in leaflet.  
   The majority of respondents were in favour with 82% of responses and the majority of the streets were above 60% in agreement.

10. If you answered Yes to Q3 or Q5 and No to Q9, what do you think could be done to address the parking problem & 11  
    Provide additional comments.  
    These two questions were collated together. The comments received back were collated in to themes/issues, as detailed below.

Key themes, issues & concerns raised:
- Recommendations and requests;
- Concerns over charges for permits;
- People parking for locations outside the St Mark area;
- Illegal/inappropriate parking creating safety issues; and
- Visitors to residents (including carers) being able to park.
1.4. **Scheme Options**

1.4.1. It is recommended that one of the following options are developed and taken forward for the next stage of consultation.

**Option 1 – ‘Permits (residents, their visitors and businesses) only beyond this point’**

1.4.2. This is the option that was initially proposed in the consultation and would be designed as follows:

- Signs would be placed on all entrances to the scheme area and then smaller repeater signs spaced at a reasonable distance apart where parking with a valid permit (residents, resident’s visitor or business permits for workers who work within the scheme area) would be allowed;
- Bays would not be marked out, there would just be sections of the road which would have no markings;
- There would be small sections of limited waiting, keeping the existing length of limited waiting in King Edwards Road and possibly introducing an additional length in near Nelson Primary School to provide facilities for visitors to the school;
- Double yellow lines would be placed at all junctions and at locations where there is a requirement for no waiting at any time. There would be a requirement to have road markings, but signs would not be required, minimising sign clutter in the area; and
- Single yellow lines would be placed at locations where it is only necessary to restrict parking for shorter periods. It is anticipated that these would be kept to a minimum to keep confusion and sign clutter to a minimum.

1.4.3. The benefits of this scheme design are:

- signage is kept to a minimum and parking bays are not marked; and
- the implementation and on-going maintenance costs are reduced.

1.4.4. However, it would not be possible to designate separate areas for residents and or businesses. All permit areas would be open to be parked in by any vehicle displaying any valid residents, resident’s visitor or business permits. Also, without sufficient repeater signs it could be confusing for visitors that are new to the area.

**Option 2 – Road side controls**

1.4.5. This option would be designed as follows:

- Permit bays would be marked out on the carriageway and can be designated as residents permit holders only, business permit holders only or permit holders only. Signs would be required for all bays;
- There will be small sections of limited waiting, likely to be in King Edwards Road and near Nelson Primary School;
- Double yellow lines would be placed at all junctions and at locations where there is a requirement for no waiting at any time. There would be a requirement to have road markings, but signs would not be required;
• Single yellow lines would be placed at locations where it is only necessary to restrict parking for shorter periods. It is anticipated that these would be kept to a minimum to keep sign clutter to a minimum; and
• There would be no zone entry signs.

1.4.6. The benefits of this scheme design are:
• bays can be individually designated for different users; and
• As all the bays will be marked out and signage would be located throughout the scheme area it would be less confusing for new visitors to the area.

1.4.7. The disadvantages of such a scheme are that there would be more signage and markings, which would also increase the cost of implementing the scheme and the on-going maintenance.

**Operational Hours**

1.4.8. Whichever option proceeds, the operational hours should be the same and in line with other controls in the surrounding areas. To the northeast of the scheme area there is the Jewellery Quarter Controlled Parking Zone, which is in operation Monday – Saturday, 8am – 6pm. However, St. Marks is in very close proximity to the NIA and other attractions in the City Centre which are attended by the public in the evenings, seven days a week.

1.4.9. The response analysis indicates that the majority of respondents would prefer the scheme to operate Monday – Friday, throughout the day. However, it is recommended that the scheme is in operation at least Monday – Saturday, 8am – 6pm, but strongly recommended this is extended to operate in the evenings too to restrict parking by visitors to the NIA and other local evening attractions.

1.4.10. If it is not considered that the scheme needs to be in operation every evening, consideration could be given to incorporate operational times when there are events on at the NIA.

**Businesses (i.e. workers who work within the scheme area)**

1.4.11. There are indications from some of the residents’ responses that they would like to see residents permit parking only. However, whilst there were no responses received from the businesses/employers within the consultation/proposed scheme area, this is not to say that they would not require some parking facility for their staff and visitors/customers.

1.4.12. As indicated in both options above, the schemes should have bays for residents, their visitors and workers who work at premises within the scheme area.

1.4.13. Whilst there were no responses received from businesses in the area, should a scheme proceed to the next stage, businesses, in particular the schools must be approached to seek their views and needs.

**1.5. Recommendations**

1.5.1. It is recommended that BCC develop one of the options detailed above and consult on the detailed design to seek the views and feedback from residents and businesses for any specific requirements.
1.5.2. A number of residents who responded requested a scheme for residents only. However, whilst there were no responses received from businesses/employers within the area, this is not to say that they will not need a facility for their workers and visitors/customers. Therefore, it is recommended that the scheme incorporates a permit scheme for businesses/workers as well as residents and their visitors within the St Marks area.

1.5.3. This recommendation is based on the following:

- BCC’s target of a 60% positive response rate was significantly exceeded, at 82%, across the scheme area; and
- All but two streets (St Marks Street and Goodman Street) had an average positive response rate of 80-100%.

1.5.4. Whilst St Marks Street and Goodman Street had a less than 60% response in favour of a scheme, these roads are part of the St Marks area and if they were not included in the scheme they would suffer from displacement should a scheme proceed in the other roads. This in mind it is recommended that St Marks Street and Goodman Street are included.
2. Introduction

2.1.1. Atkins has been commissioned by BCC to undertake a review of parking controls in the St. Marks area of Ladywood. Through consultation with local residents and businesses within the review area and subsequent analysis, this document:

- Identifies key parking issues affecting the area;
- Provides an indication of the extent to which residents and businesses are in favour of parking controls; and
- Recommends how and when parking restrictions should be applied.

2.2. Location

2.2.1. Parking in the St. Marks area has been considered an issue due to high parking demand generated from visitors and commuters to the City Centre (including the National Indoor Arena) and the Jewellery Quarter.

2.2.2. The study area for this review is illustrated in Figure 2.1.

2.2.3. In addition to this parking review, consultation is being carried out in the Central Ladywood and Waterworks & St John’s areas of Ladywood as part of separate parking reviews. These areas are located to the southwest of the St. Marks area and it is anticipated that should any parking schemes be introduced in these areas they could have an impact on St. Marks due to the displacement of vehicles.

2.2.4. Figure 2.2 shows the location of St Marks in relation to neighbouring CPZs and the Consultations for Central Ladywood and Waterworks & St John’s.
Figure 2.2: Location of St. Marks scheme area in relation to neighbouring CPZs
2.3. Background

Context

2.3.1. BCC has received comments from residents, businesses and local council Ward Members stating that they are experiencing difficulties with parking. It is believed that these difficulties are a result of the area being in close proximity to city centre destinations (such as the National Indoor Arena) and the Jewellery Quarter. Parking beat surveys confirmed that there was a high level of on-street parking on local roads, with more than 30% of vehicles being commuters/visitors, staying for more than five hours. An overview of the parking activity and parking beat surveys was provided in City Centre Parking Review Report (2011), an extract of the relevant section is provided in Appendix A.

2.3.2. Some waiting restrictions were introduced into St. Marks over the last few years to address some of the immediate issues of safety. However, these give no priority to local residents and businesses within the area; lengths of the kerbside that do not have controls are still available for parking by commuters, visitors and shoppers to the City Centre. They also restrict the overall available parking space.

2.3.3. There is a mixture of housing types in the St. Marks area which includes semi-detached, terraced and low-rise flats, some of which have off-street parking.

2.3.4. BCC is now looking to introduce a scheme to help address parking issues in the St. Marks area and to improve on-street parking provision for the local community.

2.3.5. The St. Marks initial consultation suggested the area might become a ‘permit holders only’ scheme, whereby residents and local workers within the scheme area would be eligible to apply for a permit to display in their vehicle. The parking permit scheme would restrict on-street parking during specified times (‘hours of operation’). Only vehicles displaying a valid permit (either for residents and their visitors or local businesses within the scheme area) would be able to be parked on-street in the area during the hours of operation unless otherwise specified. On-street parking bays could be provided for the local shops, with a limit on the length of stay or a charge for shoppers and visitors. Outside of the hours of operation, parking restrictions would not apply.

2.4. Consultation Purpose

2.4.1. In brief, the objectives of the consultation were to:

- Further understand the current parking situation and the concerns/issues residents and businesses are experiencing;
- Receive feedback on the principle of introducing permit parking; and
- Offer the opportunity for local residents and businesses to provide suggestions and ideas for improvement.

2.4.2. The public consultation was undertaken in the form of a leaflet distributed to the properties in the review area where residents and businesses were invited to respond. A sample of this leaflet is shown in Appendix B.

2.5. Report Structure

2.5.1. This report is structured as follows:

- The methodology of the Stage 1 consultation (Chapter 3);
- Analysis of Consultation (Chapter 4);
- Summary of analysis (Chapter 5);
- Scheme options (Chapter 6); and
- Recommendations (Chapter 7).
3. **Methodology of Stage 1 Initial Consultation**

3.1. **Approach**

3.1.1. As per the Birmingham Parking Policy, stage 1 of the Parking Review was an information gathering exercise, through public consultation, to identify the parking issues experienced in the St. Marks area and establish if residents/businesses were in favour of the proposed scheme.

3.1.2. The consultation was carried out between 11\(^{th}\) March and 30\(^{th}\) April 2013. The initial deadline for responses was 5\(^{th}\) April 2013 but this was extended to the 30\(^{th}\) April, due to concerns over the delivery of leaflets to all the properties in the area. Residents and businesses were informed of the extension via a leaflet that was delivered to each property in the area.

3.1.3. This type of consultation often receives a low-medium response rate, typically 10-20%. The Birmingham Parking Policy states that the target should be at least 60% of relevant responses in favour of the proposed parking controls, before proceeding to the next stage.

3.1.4. The following consultation activities were undertaken:

- Meetings were held with Ladywood Ward Councillors to discuss the leaflet and questionnaire content, the consultation approach and the consultation area;
- A consultation leaflet and questionnaire was delivered to all residential and business properties in the St. Marks consultation area;
- Posters were displayed in roads across the consultation area (shown in Figure 3.1) advising that a consultation was taking place and providing contact details to obtain further information;
- A dedicated consultation webpage was set up at www.birmingham.gov.uk/stmarksparking. This also included a link to an online version of the survey to maximise the response rate;
- A telephone number, email address and postal address were also provided to allow interested parties to contact the consultation team; and
- Officers attended the St. Marks Estate Resident’s meeting and Ladywood Ward Committee.

3.2. **Consultation Leaflet**

3.2.1. Approximately 600 consultation leaflets (Appendix B) were hand delivered across the consultation area (Figure 2.1) to all residential and business properties as far as reasonably possible.

3.2.2. Figure 3.1 shows the proposals as set out in the consultation leaflet; these proposals include the introduction of permit parking and limited waiting.
3.2.3. The consultation material included an explanation of the initial proposals for the parking scheme, answers to frequently asked questions and the consultation questionnaire. **Table 3.1** sets out the broad structure of the questionnaire.

**Figure 3.1: St Marks Parking Proposals**
### Table 3.1: Consultation Questionnaire Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions for All Respondents</td>
<td>• Name and property address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Status (homeowner, tenant, landlord or employer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions for homeowners, tenants and landlords</td>
<td>1. How many people aged 17+ live at your address?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How many vehicles are there in your household?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Do you think that there is a parking problem on your street?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. If yes to Q3, do you think any of the following contribute to the problem?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions for businesses and employers</td>
<td>5. Do you think there is a parking problem in the proposal area which impact on your business?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. If yes to Q5, do you think any of the following contribute to the problem?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions for All Respondents</td>
<td>7. If parking controls were introduced, which days of the week do you think would be most appropriate for controls to apply?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. If parking controls were introduced, what would be the most operating hours? Outside of these hours the restrictions would not reply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Would you be in favour of a permit holders scheme for the St Marks Estate Please note there would be a charge for permits – see information in leaflet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. If you answered yes to Q3 or Q5 and no to Q9, what do you think could be done to address the parking problem?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Provided an opportunity to add any other comments or outline any other issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4. The responses to Questions 1-9 were quantitatively analysed. Analysis of responses to the open questions (Questions 10 and 11), and other non-quantifiable communication, was more complex. In this case, an approach was used to group similar comments.

3.2.5. Further analysis of the responses was carried out to identify the consensus on the proposed parking scheme across the whole consultation area and then on a street by street basis.
4. Analysis of Consultation

4.1. Method of Analysis

4.1.1. In a number of cases, multiple responses were received from individual properties. In order to ensure equal representation for all properties within the consultation area, a proportional score was calculated for properties with multiple responses.

4.1.2. One ‘full’ response is accepted from each property. Therefore, if two responses are received from one property each answer from each questionnaire would equal 0.5 of a response, totalling one ‘full response’ and if three responses were received from one property each answer from each questionnaire would equal 0.33, again, totalling one ‘full’ response, and so on.

4.1.3. In cases where a response was received from a landlord and tenant of the same address, the 2 responses were counted separately to allow their different interests to be represented.

4.1.4. In addition to the questionnaire responses 1 email and 3 phone calls were received with general queries, issues or comments to make.

*Note: Questions 1 to 4 were for homeowners, tenants and landlords only, whilst Questions 5 and 6 were for businesses and employers only. All respondents were asked to complete Questions 7 to 11.*

4.2. Questionnaire Responses

4.2.1. A total of 97 responses were received from the consultation, of these 11 were duplicates (i.e. more than one per household) and the proportional scoring was applied to these.

4.2.2. The following responses were removed from survey analysis:

- 1 response which provided no address details and duplicated two other responses of the same name.

4.2.3. After the proportional scoring was applied and the two incomplete results were removed, a total of 86 clean responses were represented in the final analysis.

4.2.4. Based on the delivery of approximately 600 leaflets, this represents a response rate of approximately 14%. As stated earlier, it is not unusual for consultation of this type to receive such a response rate. It should also be noted that not all of the respondents answered all of the questions within the questionnaire.

4.2.5. *Figure 4.1* shows the number of clean responses (a total of 86) from each tenancy category.
4.2.6. All of the respondents were tenants or homeowners, with the exception of one respondent who was a landlord. All survey respondents completed this question.

4.2.7. There were no responses received from businesses/employers. Therefore Questions 5 and 6, which relate to responses from businesses/employers, have not been included in the analysis.

4.2.8. It should be noted that for all questions, the results may not reflect the opinion of all households in the area.

Question 1: How many people aged 17+ live at your address?
*Answered by home owners, tenants and landlords*

4.2.9. Figure 4.2 shows the occupancy levels of households within the study area (as indicated by the respondents).

4.2.10. 84.5 residential properties responded to Question 1 out of a total of 86, with an average occupancy (people aged 17 years or older) of 1.8 people.

4.2.11. It is clear that this question was misunderstood by a number of households, 7 households responded that there were no over 17 year olds living at their address. It is unlikely these responses are accurate and it is anticipated that the respondents have not included themselves in their response. Due to the uncertainty in what the actual occupancy is in these properties, these 7 responses were not included when calculating the average occupancy levels in St Marks.
Question 2: How many vehicles are there in your household?

Answered by home owners, tenants and landlords

4.2.12. Figure 4.3 shows the number of vehicles at each household within the study area.

![Figure 4.3: How many vehicles are there in your household?](image)

4.2.13. 84 residential properties responded to Question 2 out of a total of 86, with a resulting average vehicle ownership level of 1.2 vehicles per household.

Question 3: Do you think that there is a parking problem in your street?

Answered by home owners, tenants and landlords

4.2.14. Figure 4.4 shows the percentage of respondents who believed parking was a problem in their street.

![Figure 4.4: Do you think that there is a parking problem in your street?](image)
4.2.15. 84 residential properties responded to Question 3 out of a total of 86. A majority of 87% of respondents (75 properties) indicated that there is a problem with parking in their street, whilst 10% (9 properties) did not believe parking was a problem on their street.

**Question 4: If you answered ‘Yes’ to Q3, do you think any of the following contribute towards the problem? (Please tick all that apply)**

**Answered by home owners, tenants and landlords who answered ‘yes’ for question 3**

- Residents own too many vehicles
- Visitors / shoppers park on-street
- Local workers park on-street
- Vehicles parked by commuters making onward trips by public transport to final destinations outside of the St Marks area
- Vehicles park in locations which cause problems for other motorists to pass safely
- Vehicles park in locations which cause problems with visibility at junctions
- Vehicles park in locations which affect pedestrians and cyclists
- Other (please provide further information)

4.2.16. **Figure 4.5** shows the issues that respondents believe contribute to the parking problems in their street.

As the questionnaire stated that respondents should tick all options that apply for this question, many respondents had ticked more than one option. Therefore, the total ‘ticks’ is higher than the number of clean responses.

![Figure 4.5: Do you think any of the following contribute towards the problem?](image)

4.2.17. Of the 75 properties who thought there was a problem with parking on their road, 73 responded to this question – with most selecting more than one option.

4.2.18. The highest perceived contributing factors are local workers parking on the street (64), followed by vehicles being parked by commuters who make onward trips to final destinations outside the St Marks area (59), vehicles parking in locations which cause problems with visibility at junctions (41.75) and visitors/shoppers parking on-street (37.5).

**Note:** Questions 5 and 6 have been omitted due to no businesses/employers completing the survey.
Question 7: If parking controls were introduced, which days of the week do you think would be most appropriate for controls to apply? (Please tick one option)

Answered by all respondents

4.2.19. Figure 4.6 sets out the days that residents think would be the most appropriate for controls to apply.

![Figure 4.6: Which days of the week do you think would be most appropriate for controls to apply?](image)

4.2.20. 82 residential properties responded to Question 7 out of a total of 86. A majority of 56% of respondents (48.5 properties) indicated that controls operating Monday to Friday would be most appropriate followed by 22% (19 properties) who stated that controls operating seven days a week would be most appropriate and 17% (14.5 properties) favoured controls operating Monday to Saturday.

Question 8: If parking controls were introduced, what do you think would be the most appropriate operating hours? Outside of these hours the restrictions would not apply. (Please tick one option)

Answered by all respondents

- A short period during the day which stops all day parking (e.g. 11am – 12 noon)
- All day (e.g. 8am – 6pm)
- All day and evenings (e.g. 8am – 10pm)
- Other (please detail)
4.2.21. **Figure 4.7** sets out the times of day that residents think would be the most appropriate for controls to apply.

![Figure 4.7](image)

**Figure 4.7**: If parking controls were introduced, what do you think would be the most appropriate operating hours?

4.2.22. 79.5 residential properties responded to Question 8 out of a total of 86. A majority of 57% of respondents (49.25 properties) indicated that controls operating all day would be most appropriate followed by 17% (15 properties) stating that controls operating in the day and evenings would be most appropriate.

**Question 9: Would you be in favour of parking controls being introduced in your area? Please note there would be a charge for permits – see information in leaflet.**

*Answered by all respondents*

4.2.23. **Figure 4.8** sets out whether respondents are in favour of parking controls being introduced into their area.

![Figure 4.8](image)

**Figure 4.8**: Would you be in favour of parking controls being introduced in your area?
4.2.24. 85 residential properties responded to Question 9 out of a total of 86. A majority of 82% of respondents (70.75 properties) indicated that they would be in favour of controls being introduced.

**Question 10: If you answered ‘Yes’ to Q3 or Q5 and ‘No’ to Q9, what do you think could be done to address the parking problem?**  
*Answered by all respondents*

**Question 11: Additional Comments**  
*Answered by all respondents*

4.2.25. The results from Questions 10 and 11 were analysed together as many respondents used both to raise issues and comments/suggestions.

**Key themes identified from Questions 10 and 11 and emails and telephone calls received**

4.2.26. The key issues raised by respondents in questions 10 and 11, as well as in emails and telephone calls, have been summarised by road in a table and can be found in Appendix C. The key themes from this table are detailed below:

**Recommendations and Requests**

4.2.27. A number of requests were received from respondents. These have been summarised below:

**Additional yellow line controls**

4.2.28. A common request was for the implementation of additional yellow lines at various locations in the St Marks area. If a scheme is to go ahead the whole area would be reviewed to establish where it would be safe for vehicles to be parked and where it would not be safe or would cause access issues or obstruction. This could result in yellow lines (waiting controls) being introduced at junctions to improve visibility and at other locations to allow access or to reduce obstruction. However, these areas would be restricted for all vehicles, including residents and local workers.

4.2.29. Vehicles displaying valid permits, for residents, resident's visitors (and possibly for local workers within the scheme area), would only be able to park in the areas allocated for permit holders only.

**Permits for residents only and/or provided free of charge**

4.2.30. A number of respondents have stated that they would like a scheme that is for resident permit holders only. Some of these respondents are willing to pay for the permit, some respondents would like the permits to be free and some would like to have one free permit then pay for subsequent permits.
4.2.31. Should a scheme go ahead, full consideration will be given to whether the permit scheme would be for residents only or if there should be some facility provided to workers who work within the scheme area.

4.2.32. With regards to the requests for permits being provided to residents free of charge, this will not be possible. Outside the existing city centre Controlled Parking Zones, the first residents permit (per household) is currently £15 per annum and any subsequent permit is £30 per annum. Regrettably, it is not possible to provide permits free of charge as there are costs associated with any parking scheme that is introduced, including the administration and processing of the permits, enforcement and maintaining the signage and markings that are in place. However, the permit prices are considered to be reasonable and give the holder some additional convenience in that some of the kerb space is allocated for permit holders only, as opposed to a ‘free for all’.

4.2.33. Residents within the scheme area will be eligible to purchase (currently £2.50 for a book of five day permits) resident’s visitor permits to give to their visitors to display in their vehicles when parking in the designated permits areas.

   **Carers**

4.2.34. It is acknowledged that some residents have carers who visit their properties to provide assistance to the resident.

4.2.35. Residents who regularly require family carers to visit them at their residence can apply for residents’ permits which their carers can also use. Residents’ visitor permits can also be used. In the case of professional carers, medical organisations can apply for waivers for staff that carry out visits to patients in the area. These are considered on a case by case basis and currently cost £30 for three months.

   **Hours and days of control**

4.2.36. A number of different hours and days of control have been suggested, which all will be considered, as well as considering what will work for the area as a whole. Consistency with other similar schemes will also be a key factor in determining operational hours.
Visitor (non-resident), Shopper and Commuter Parking

4.2.37. A large number of respondents have indicated that most of the parking problems are as a result of a large number of commuters, visitors and shoppers parking in the area to go to work and use the shopping and leisure facilities/attractions in the City Centre.

4.2.38. Without any controls in place it is not possible to control who parks where. Any vehicle can be parked on the public highways where there are no controls in place, without being penalised. However, the proposed scheme would only allow local residents, their visitors and local workers within the scheme area displaying a valid permit to park in the area designated permit bays during the operational hours. Visitors would be able to park in the bays that have been designated as pay and display or limited waiting.

4.2.39. A scheme such as that proposed would restrict visitor (non-resident), shopper and commuter parking. Therefore, residents and resident’s visitors (and possibly local workers within the scheme area) who display valid permits in their vehicles will be given more opportunity to be able to park near their homes or place of work.

Illegal and Inappropriate Parking

4.2.40. Concerns were raised by a large number of respondents in relation to vehicles being parked inconsiderately and dangerously on the footway, in front of driveways, at junctions and on occasions, parking in such a way that it is difficult for other vehicles to pass safely, especially emergency and service vehicles.

4.2.41. Parking too close to junctions can be dangerous as it reduces the sight lines of motorists attempting to exit and enter a junction, as well as being dangerous for pedestrians and wheelchair users wishing to cross the road. Furthermore, whilst certain junctions in the area do not have any double yellow line junction protection, it states in the Highway Code that motorists should not park on the road where it would endanger, inconvenience or obstruct pedestrians or other road users, going on to state that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction. This is the case even if there are no yellow lines restricting parking. If there are no yellow lines in operation, this is not enforceable by the Council’s Civil Enforcement Officers, but the Police can enforce for obstruction.

4.2.42. A number of respondents complained about motorists parking their vehicles on the footway. If controls were introduced BCC would be able to issue penalty charge notices to vehicles parked on the footway.

Other

4.2.43. Concerns were raised regarding a lack of enforcement in the area of the existing parking controls. Whilst the Parking Enforcement team regularly conduct patrols in the area, it is not always possible to monitor every contravention of the controls which occurs. Nevertheless, all responses regarding these issues have been noted.
4.3. **Further Analysis**

4.3.1. To put into more context the ‘outcome’ of the consultation, the responses to Questions 3 and 9 have been considered further on a street by street basis to establish the views of respondents in relation to if there are any parking problems and if they are in favour of a scheme proceeding or not.

**Street by Street Analysis – Question 3**

4.3.2. Respondents were asked whether they think that there is a parking problem in their street (Question 3). 87% stated that they think that there is a parking problem. The two most common problems selected by respondents were:

- Vehicles parked by commuters who are making onward trips by public transport to final destinations outside of the St Marks area; and
- Local workers parking on the street.

4.3.3. Whilst the results provide an overview, there is a need to look a little more in depth at the responses on a street-by-street basis in order to determine whether opinions vary at each location.

4.3.4. **Figure 4.9** shows the percentage of respondents, on a street-by-street basis, that believe there is a parking problem.

4.3.5. The percentage of respondents that believe there is a problem is between 80% and 100% on all streets except St Marks Street where the percentage of respondents that believe there is a problem is between 40% and 59%.

**Street by Street Analysis – Question 9**

4.3.6. Question 9 asked respondents whether they were in favour of the parking controls proposed in the consultation leaflet.

4.3.7. The results show an overall positive response to the parking controls proposed in the consultation leaflet; with 83% stating that they are in favour and 16% stating that they are not in favour (1% of the total respondents did not respond to this question).

4.3.8. Although the majority of the respondents have stated that they are in favour, this does not necessarily reflect the views of all residents in the St. Marks area. However, the number of responses that are in favour of a scheme exceeds the target of 60% of responses required for a scheme to be taken forward as set out in BCC’s Parking Policy.

4.3.9. **Figure 4.10** shows the percentage of respondents, on a street-by-street basis, that are in favour of the parking controls proposed in the consultation leaflet.

4.3.10. The majority of the streets in the St Marks area were over 80% in favour. The only two streets with residents that were less than 80% in favour were St Marks Street and Goodman Street. Respondents on both of these streets were between 40% and 59% in favour.
Figure 4.9: Percentage of respondents who feel there is a parking problem in their street, on a street-by-street basis
Figure 4.10: Percentage of respondents in favour of a scheme on a street-by-street basis
5. Summary of Analysis

5.1.1. A total of 98 people responded to the survey; representing 86 properties (calculated using a proportional score method as set out in Section 4.1).

5.1.2. In the survey questions were included for businesses/employers to complete. No responses were received from businesses/employers. However this is likely to be due to the low number of businesses in the area (by far the majority of properties being residential houses and flats).

5.2. Question 1 – How many people aged 17+ live at your address?

5.2.1. This question was included to help establish the demographics of the St Marks area. However, it appears that there has been some misunderstanding by respondents as several responded that there was nobody aged 17 or over living at their address. It is expected that these respondents instead stated the number of people living in the household in addition to themselves.

5.3. Question 2 – How many vehicles are there in your household?

5.3.1. The results showed that the average number of vehicles per household of those surveyed was 1.2 with the majority of the respondents having one vehicle at their address, followed by properties with two vehicles.

5.4. Question 3 – Do you think that there is a parking problem in your street?

5.4.1. The majority of respondents (87%) believe that there is a parking problem in the St Marks area. Although on St Marks Street less than 60% of respondents believed that there was a problem on their street, it is highly anticipated that if controls were implemented on other streets in the St Marks area parking problems in St Marks Street would significantly increase due to the displacement of vehicles.

5.5. Question 4 – If you answered ‘Yes’ to Q3, do you think any of the following contribute towards the problem? (list details under Q4 in Chapter 3)

5.5.1. From the results of Question 4, it is clear that vehicles are being parked to access destinations outside of the St Marks area and that the level of parking in the area is causing concerns over safety. The survey results highlight commuters, local workers, visitors and shoppers as being the main contributors to the parking problem.

5.6. Question 5 & 6 – these were for businesses.

5.7. No business responses were received
5.8. Questions 7 (If parking controls were introduced, which days of the week do you think would be most appropriate for the controls to apply?) & 8 (If parking controls were introduced, what do you think would be the most appropriate operating hours?)

5.8.1. Monday to Friday is the most popular period for restrictions to be applied with most of the respondents stating that restrictions should apply all day. However, there have been some comments made to suggest there are issues in the evenings, possibly in connection with the NIA.

5.9. Question 9 – Would you be in favour of parking controls being introduced in your area?

5.9.1. When asked whether they were in favour of a permit holders only scheme for the St. Marks Estate, the majority of respondents (82%) were in agreement. The majority of the streets were also in favour at 80-100%, with only St Marks Street and Goodman Street being 40-59% in favour). However, it is anticipated that with the introduction of restrictions in other streets in St Marks, parking problems are likely to increase in all streets within the proposed area if not included in a scheme.

5.10. Questions 10 - If you answered ‘Yes’ to Q3 or Q5 and ‘No’ to Q9, what do you think could be done to address the parking problem? & 11 – Additional comments

5.10.1. The results from Questions 10 and 11 were analysed together as many respondents used both to raise issues and comments/suggestions.

Key Issues

5.10.2. Overall, the general consensus from the responses received is that there is a parking problem in the St Marks area and in the majority of the streets over 60% of properties agree with the proposed parking restrictions.

5.10.3. Comments received by the respondents highlighted the issues. The key issues raised by the respondents were:
- Recommendations and requests;
- Concerns over charges for permits;
- People parking for locations outside the St Mark area;
- Illegal/inappropriate parking creating safety issues; and
- Visitors to residents (including carers) being able to park.

5.10.4. Key issues are broken down by road in Appendix C.
6. Scheme Options

6.1.1. It is recommended that one of the following options are developed and taken forward for the next stage of consultation.

6.2. Option 1 – ‘Permits (residents, their visitors and businesses) only beyond this point’

6.2.1. This is the option that was initially proposed in the consultation and would be designed as follows:

- Signs would be placed on all entrances to the scheme area and then smaller repeater signs spaced at a reasonable distance apart where parking with a valid permit (residents, resident’s visitor or business permits for workers who work within the scheme area) would be allowed;

- Bays would not be marked out, there would just be sections of the road which would have no markings;

- There would be small sections of limited waiting, keeping the existing length of limited waiting in King Edwards Road and possibly introducing an additional length in near Nelson Primary School to provide facilities for visitors to the school;

- Double yellow lines would be placed at all junctions and at locations where there is a requirement for no waiting at any time. There would be a requirement to have road markings, but signs would not be required, minimising sign clutter in the area; and

- Single yellow lines would be placed at locations where it is only necessary to restrict parking for shorter periods. It is anticipated that these would be kept to a minimum to keep confusion and sign clutter to a minimum.

6.2.2. The benefits of this scheme design are:

- signage is kept to a minimum and parking bays are not marked; and

- the implementation and on-going maintenance costs are reduced.

6.2.3. However, it would not be possible to designate separate areas for residents and for businesses. All permit areas would be open to be parked in by any vehicle displaying any valid residents, resident’s visitor or business permits. Also, without sufficient repeater signs it could be confusing for visitors that are new to the area.

6.3. Option 2 – Road side controls

6.3.1. This option would be designed as follows:

- Permit bays would be marked out on the carriageway and can be designated as residents permit holders only, business permit holders only or permit holders only. Signs would be required for all bays;

- There will be small sections of limited waiting, likely to be in King Edwards Road and near Nelson Primary School;
Double yellow lines would be placed at all junctions and at locations where there is a requirement for no waiting at any time. There would be a requirement to have road markings, but signs would not be required;

Single yellow lines would be placed at locations where it is only necessary to restrict parking for shorter periods. It is anticipated that these would be kept to a minimum to keep sign clutter to a minimum; and

There would be no zone entry signs.

6.3.2. The benefits of this scheme design are:

- bays can be individually designated for different types of users; and

- as all the bays will be marked out and signage would be located throughout the scheme area it would be less confusing for new visitors to the area.

6.3.3. The disadvantages of such a scheme are that there would be more signage and markings, increasing sign clutter, which would also increase the cost of implementing the scheme and the on-going maintenance.

6.4. Operational Hours

6.4.1. Whichever option proceeds, the operational hours should be the same and in line with other controls in the surrounding areas. To the northeast of the scheme area there is the Jewellery Quarter Controlled Parking Zone, which operates Monday – Saturday, 8am – 6pm. However, St. Marks is in very close proximity to the NIA and other attractions in the City Centre which are attended by the public in the evenings, seven days a week.

6.4.2. The response analysis indicates that the majority of respondents would prefer the scheme to operate Monday – Friday, throughout the day. However, it is recommended that the scheme is in operation at least Monday – Saturday, 8am – 6pm, but strongly recommended this is extended to operate in the evenings too to restrict parking by visitors to the NIA and other local evening attractions.

6.4.3. If it is not considered that the scheme needs to be in operation every evening, consideration could be given to incorporate operational times when there are events on at the NIA.

6.5. Businesses (i.e. workers who work in the scheme area)

6.5.1. There are indications from some of the residents’ responses that they would like to see residents permit parking only. However, whilst there were no responses received from the businesses/employers within the consultation/proposed scheme area, this is not to say that they would not require some parking facility for their staff and visitors/customers.

6.5.2. As indicated in both options above, the schemes should have bays for residents, their visitors and workers who work at premises within the scheme area.

6.5.3. Whilst there were no responses received from businesses in the area, should a scheme proceed to the next stage, businesses, in particular the schools must be approached to seek their views and needs.
7. Recommendations

7.1.1. It is recommended that BCC develop one of the options detailed above and undertake further consultation on the detailed option to seek the views and feedback from residents and businesses for any specific requirements.

7.1.2. A number of residents who responded requested a scheme for residents only. However, whilst there were no responses received from businesses/employers within the area, this is not to say that they will not need a facility for their workers and visitors/customers. Therefore, it is recommended that the scheme incorporates a permit scheme for businesses/workers as well as residents and their visitors within the St Marks area.

7.1.3. This recommendation is based on the following:

- BCC’s target of a 60% positive response rate was significantly exceeded, at 83%, across the scheme area; and
- All but two streets (St Marks Street and Goodman Street) had an average positive response rate of 80-100%.

7.1.4. Although the positive response rate was below 60% on St Marks Street and Goodman Street, it is anticipated that the parking situation would become significantly worse if controls were introduced in other streets in the St Marks area. The results show 100% of respondents\(^1\) from Goodman Street and 58% of respondents on St Marks Street stated that there was a parking problem on their street. However, no other feasible solutions to the parking problems were received from residents on St Marks Street or Goodman Street with a number of comments stating that parking restrictions would be a suitable solution.

7.1.5. Due to the anticipated impact on St Marks Street and Goodman Street, it is recommended that any scheme introduced incorporates St Marks Street and Goodman Street in line with the other streets in the St Marks area.

\(^1\) Note: only 3 properties from Goodman Street responded, all stating that there is a parking problem on their street.
Appendix A. Extract from City Centre Parking Review Report (2011)

**KEY LAND USE AND ATTRACTIONS**

- Predominantly a residential area with some small retail parades, schools and other local services; and
- Nearby attractions include Broad Street, Brindley Place, Five Ways, Broadway Plaza and the National Indoor Arena (NIA)

**CURRENT PARKING ACTIVITY**

Currently the conflict for parking in this area comes from local residents, external commuters and visitors. The area is predominantly residential but the nearby attractions of Broad Street, Brindley Place, National Indoor Arena (NIA) and Five Ways, as well as the wider city centre attractions, create demand for parking from people visiting other parts of the city.

There are currently only a few parts of the proposed Zone which have on-street controls. These include some limited waiting bays in Guild Close (close to the Action for Children Centre) and some restricted parking (no stopping between 5am and 6am) along Great Tindal Street/St Vincent Street/Ledsam Street. There are also sections of School Keep Clear along Gilby Road and no waiting at any time at junctions. Along Grosvenor Street there are double yellow lines along both sides of the carriageway although there appears to be room for additional parking.

The pressure on on-street parking is increased as there are no off-street car parks located within the area. There are however many off-street facilities close to the boundaries of the zone. The largest of these are at the NIA (split across 3 car parks) and Broadway Plaza. The car park data provided by BCC indicates that the occupancy levels of the Broadway Plaza Car Park are low (just 20%). It is possible that the introduction of additional parking controls could encourage more use of this car park.

Although no survey data has yet been considered for the specific effect caused by events (such as at the NIA), it is thought that this area is used by visitors as an alternative to the off-street car parks closer to the venues. The on-street parking is likely to be more appealing to visitors to events as it is cheaper and more accessible.

Residents make up the majority of the land use with terraced housing and high rise flats the most common building types. Many of the houses appear to have off-street parking either from garages, driveways or in private car parks connected to their accommodation. The parking beat surveys (see page 32 and 33) show that around Ryland Street and Sherborne Street there appears to be a high demand for parking. This is likely to be residents (and visitors of the residents) of the Jupiter development.

In the residential cul-de-sacs (e.g. Power Crescent, Rann Close, Ledbury Close, Guild Close), it is often unclear where the boundary of private and public highway land is. The housing and tower blocks (e.g. Wells Tower in Rodney Close) have car parks in close proximity of the buildings which appear to be for the private use of the residents in these flats.

The parking demand in the streets within this proposed Zone is likely to also be impacted by vehicle displacement from other areas that have CPZ controls. To the south of the area (south of the A4540), the Chamberlain Gardens CPZ has been operational since the start of 2010. Displacement from this area appears to have caused vehicles to park in the south of the Zone (e.g. Power Crescent, Morville Street and Rann Close). There is reasonable access from within this Zone for people who require...
parking to work within the Chamberlain Gardens CPZ and using the streets within this area would mean they would not have to purchase a parking permit.

To the north of the area is the Jewellery Quarter CPZ. This CPZ has recently been under review and construction is currently under way on a revised scheme (due for completion June 2011). Whilst it is possible that there is some displacement parking at the moment, it is likely that the design changes will lead to more vehicles parking in this Zone as there will be less free parking available. This effect would mean an increase in demand for parking in the northern parts of the Westside area.

The area is served by a number of bus services which follow the A4540 Inner Ring Road and along Broad Street. However, there is little penetration of services that go through the Westside Zone. The only time buses do enter the area are on Friday and Saturday nights where an alternative route via King Edwards Road and Sheepcote Street is used to avoid the congestion along Broad Street. The area is 15/20 minute walk from the city centre rail stations.

SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS (Survey Area 8 as shown in Figure 3.1)

For the purpose of presenting the survey data, Zone D has been divided into a North and South area. The boundary follows the route of the railway line which enters the city from Smethwick (south of St Marks Crescent and north of Lighthorne Avenue).

Surveys were undertaken in this area on Tuesday 23rd November 2010.

North Westside

The graph below shows the average occupancy of available on-street parking. The graph below shows the average occupancy of available on-street parking. The estimated legal on-street parking space on each street is shown in brackets.

The line on the graph indicates 85% occupancy. This is an indicative benchmark set for BBC's Parking Policy for new
CPZs/RPSs. Areas where parking demand is greater than 85% of the legal on-street space and non-resident parking is over 50% of all parking, are suitable to be considered for residents parking controls.

- At 8am, Acorn Grove and St Marks Street are over 90% full;
- During the Inter Peak, none of the ten streets are on average more than 100% capacity. Only one of the streets is over 80% full;
- At 5pm, only Sherborne Grove is over 75% full.
- At 9pm, the whole area is an average of 47% full. The busiest streets are Acorn Grove (76% full) and Sherborne Grove (75% full);
- There is a clear issue with St Marks Street during the AM Peak period. At 6am, the surveys indicated that the parking was over capacity indicating a possible issue with overnight parking. Acorn Grove also has capacity issue during the AM Peak.

An indication of the parking bay occupancy for the whole of the Westside Zone is provided as a map presented in Appendix B. The map shows the average occupancy of bays during the Inter Peak period (10AM – 4PM). The data is taken from the parking beat surveys discussed in this section.

South Westside

The graph below shows the average occupancy of available on-street parking. The estimated legal on-street parking space on each street is shown in brackets.
The line on the graph indicates 85% occupancy. This is an indicative benchmark set for BBC’s Parking Policy for new CPZs/RPSs. Areas where parking demand is greater than 85% of the legal on-street space and non-resident parking is over 50% of all parking, are suitable to be considered for residents parking controls.

- At 8am, Gilby Road / Friston Avenue, Grosvenor Street West, Ledsam Street, Morville Street, Power Crescent, Ryland Street and St Vincent Street are all over 90% full;
- During the Inter Peak, three of the eighteen streets are on average more than 110% capacity;
- At 5pm, Grosvenor Street West, Morville Street and Sherborne Street are over 75% full; and
- At 9pm, the whole area is an average of 60% full. The busiest streets are Grosvenor Street West (90% full), Morville Street (110% full) and Sherborne Street (126% full).

An indication of the parking bay occupancy for the whole of the Westside Zone is provided as a map presented in Appendix B. The map shows the average occupancy of bays during the Inter Peak period (10AM – 4PM). The data is taken from the parking beat surveys discussed in this section.
DEVELOPMENTS

The development information provided by BCC (up to date April 2010) indicated 7 main development sites within the Westside area. These are shown on the plan below.

1 – Education to Assembly and Leisure (17000 m²), 2 – Residential to Industrial, 3 – Blakemere House Residential Site to Residential, 4 – Vacant Land to Residential (21 flats), 5 – Public Building to Residential (167 flats), 6 – Industrial to Mixed Use (6 dwelling conversions, 84 m² of office space), 7 – Transportation to Communal Residential (46 hotel beds).

There are also plans to create new open space, between the railway line and the canal, adjacent to Lighthorne Avenue.

The Big City Plan and the information on City Centre development plans provided by BCC (dated April 2010) have been used as sources of information.
**OFF-STREET CAR PARKS**

There are no publicly available car parks within the Zone.

There are however 10 publicly available off-street car park located close to the boundary of the zone. Data on capacity, occupancy and turnover has been provided as available by BCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car Park</th>
<th>No. of Spaces</th>
<th>Peak Occupancy (number of vehicles; % full)</th>
<th>Of vehicles which are parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brindley Place (26/11/09)</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>12pm-1pm 706 (78%)</td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td>Car Park is over 70% full between 11am and 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Plaza (17/11/09)</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>2pm-3pm 307 (24%)</td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td>Car Park is over 20% full between 11am and 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsgate Street (17/11/09)</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1pm-2pm 256 (62%)</td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td>Car Park is over 50% full between 10am and 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennant Street Euro (23/11/09)</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1pm-2pm 138 (53%)</td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td>Car Park is over 50% full between 11am and 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennant Street City Council</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td><em>No survey data has been provided for this car park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennant Street Midway Parks</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td><em>No survey data has been provided for this car park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennant Street CCS</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td><em>No survey data has been provided for this car park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Central Travelodge</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td><em>No survey data has been provided for this car park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Street Urban</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td><em>No survey data has been provided for this car park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Indoor Arena (total of the 3 car parks)</td>
<td>2228</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of vehicles parked before 10am, what percentage stays for longer than 7 hours?</td>
<td><em>No survey data has been provided for this car park</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a large private car park attached to the Tesco store on the corner of Five Ways roundabout which provides parking for people shopping at the store.
SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

Given the size of this area, it has been considered appropriate to divide the region into two Zones. These are split using the natural boundary of the Smethwick railway line which runs east-west (to the south of St Marks Crescent and north of Lighthorne Avenue). The proposals for the North and South areas are separately presented below and the proposed parking controls across the South Westside Zone are presented on Figure 4.5.

North Westside

- The Outer Zone CPZ (to the east), A457 Sand Pits and the Jewellery Quarter CPZ (to the north), the A4540 Inner Ring Road (to the west) and the Smethwick railway line (to the south) provide natural boundaries for the Zone;
- The area is predominantly residential, and many of the properties do appear to have some off-street car parking space;
- Data shows that none of the streets within this area are over capacity during either the peak periods or the Inter Peak period. During the Inter Peak period (4PM – 6PM), the whole of this area is on average only 65% full. This is less than BCC’s benchmark value of 85% demand;
- The survey results indicate that St Marks Crescent is in medium demand. However, anecdotal, local knowledge indicates that parking in this area is often in high demand. It is recommended that further site visits are carried out to this location to further identify the requirements.
- It is acknowledged that there is the potential that the parking issues in this Zone may worsen as a result of displacement from the Jewellery Quarter CPZ which is currently being constructed on the other side of the A457 Summer Hill Road. This CPZ is due to become operational in May 2011 and will reduce the amount of free parking north of the A457. It is therefore anticipated that drivers may look to use the free parking within the North Westside Zone instead;
- Following the implementation of the Jewellery Quarter CPZ, a review will take place. It is recommended that the parking in North Westside is reconsidered at this point, and if appropriate, proposals to provide controls to assist the local residents can be prepared. The surveys collected for this study will be used as a part of the post-implementation review of the Jewellery Quarter CPZ.

South Westside

The proposed parking controls for the Westside South area are presented on Figure 4.5. The plans also provide more details on the proposed bays and the evidence base for the proposals.

- The Outer Zone CPZ (to the east), Smethwick railway line (to the north) and the A4540 Inner Ring Road to the south and west provide natural boundaries for the Zone;
- Data shows that significant proportion of the area has greater than 85% of legal on-street space used during the Inter Peak period;
- Proposals provide a mix of permit holder bays, resident permit holder only bays and short term pay and display bays;
- Business permits would be available to provide parking for local workers and staff at the school; and
- The short stay bays should be designated as pay and display, limited waiting or a mix of the two;

Analysis of this Zone identified that the key aim of any parking controls should be to protect parking provisions for local residents and to support the local businesses. In areas where a lack of available space is causing drivers to park dangerously, the controls can also help to reduce this indiscriminate parking and improve safety. The parking survey data (see page 33) shows that, particularly in the south of the Zone (Ruston Street, Grosvenor Street, etc), on-street parking space is over capacity.

The parking proposals (presented in Figure 4.5) show a mix of any permit bays and resident permit only bays across the Zone. These have been allocated in streets which appear to be residential, and where the survey data appears to show that all day parking is occurring. Whilst it is unclear whether or not the all day parking is local workers or other commuters, the proposals will still allow people who work in the area to
park, whilst reducing the amount of parking for people from outside the area who wish to park for free and walk to other parts of the city centre.

The any permit bays have been provided in areas closer to the main employment hubs (as shown in Figure 4.5; e.g. Ledsam Street by the industrial works). It is anticipated that in these areas, workers will be able to park along with the local residents. It may however be appropriate to allocate a small number of business permit only bays should an initial consultation indicate a strong demand for this.

The demand for parking is increased in the areas as there are no off-street car parks within the Zone (as indicated on Page 34). There are however a large number of facilities available closer to the city centre (Brindley Place, NIA, etc), to the east of Broad Street (Tennant Street, etc) and at Broadway Plaza to the south. Long stay visitors would either be required to use a visitor permit (to be issued by a local resident or business) or would have to pay to use one of these off-street car parks and walk to destinations within the South Westside Zone.

The boundaries for the area have been defined, based on the current parking activity and the natural barriers which exist, such as the Smethwick railway line. As shown in Figure 4.5, the proposed Zone does not include Kilby Avenue or Lighthorne Avenue. This was because the parking survey data did not show there to be any clear issues with parking in this area at the moment. It is felt that significant displacement of vehicles into these streets was less likely, as the cul-de-sac forms a natural barrier. Whether or not these streets should be included should be considered by BCC. Including them within any initial consultation would also be recommended to understand the viewpoint of the local residents.

The parking proposals have not accounted for any significant changes to the land use, resulting from any developments. As outlined on page 34, the development plans for the area are not substantial but will create a new industrial site, a couple of residential blocks and some leisure space. It is felt that the proposals presented in Figure 4.5 would be able to largely accommodate the change in demand which these developments create. If other regeneration happens in the longer term there may be a need to review the controls.

Within the residential areas, an initial site assessment shows that some indiscriminate echelon parking currently occurs, particularly along Ryland Street which encroaches into the carriageway. This area is marked in the annotations to Figure 4.5. The echelon parking restricts access for passing vehicles and is a safety hazard when parking and exiting the bays. The existing carriageway design is not suitable for echelon parking, and it is generally discouraged from forming a part of a carriageway parking design due to the associated safety issues for vehicles when exiting spaces. It is therefore recommended that bays are marked as parallel parking bays in any new design. Whilst the current parking habits are ‘informal’, parallel parking will mean that the number of parking ‘spaces’ will reduce.

There is a section of echelon parking on St Vincent Street West, which is part of the existing design, unlike the ‘informal’ echelon parking that occurs in Ryland Street. Whilst, echelon parking is rarely incorporated in street design due to the safety issues when parking and exiting the bays, on this occasion Atkins would recommend that these bays remain as they are for the initial design. The safety issues should be minimal as there are traffic calming measures in place and a Road Safety Audit (stage 1 & 2) will be carried out at design stage. Enquiries can also be made in relation to road traffic accident levels.

For all scheme design proposals presented in this report, no waiting at any time restrictions would be marked on all junctions to ensure safety. The locations of all bays would be subject to a site visit at a subsequent stage. Specialised bay designations such as loading bays or disabled bays are likely to be required. The location of these would be identified from initial consultation with stakeholders.
Appendix B. St Marks On-Street Parking Review leaflet
St. Marks Parking Review – FAQ’s

Q: Why is a “Permit Holders Only” scheme being suggested?
A: We believe that a “Permit Holders Only” scheme in St Marks would provide ordered parking for the local community, reduce traffic congestion and reduce the problems associated with city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.

Q: What is the charges for parking permits?
A: The charges for a month’s county permits are likely to be:
- Resident Permits - £325
- Short Term - £150
- Business Permits - £150
- Residents’ visitor permits - £30 for a book of 5 all day tickets

Q: Will residents only be able to purchase a permit if they park on street during the residential hours of 9am to 6pm?
A: Yes, only residents and local businesses who park on street in St Marks during these hours would be eligible to purchase a parking permit to display in their vehicle.

Q: What are we hoping to achieve with the “Permit Holders Only” scheme?
A: We are hoping to achieve the following:
- To gather information from local people and the local community to better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.
- To reduce parking illegally on the street, which is causing drivers to park dangerously or inconsiderately, controls could help to reduce illegal parking and improve safety.

Q: Who are we consulting on the option of a “Permit Holders Only” scheme?
A: We are consulting on the option of a “Permit Holders Only” scheme in St. Marks Estate.

Q: Why are we suggesting a “Permit Holders Only” scheme in St. Marks?
A: After discussion with local residents and the local community, it is clear that there is a need for parking controls in this area. We are now looking to see if there is sufficient support for this scheme. We believe that this is an opportunity to improve existing parking provision for the local community.

Q: What is the charges for parking permits?
A: The charges for a month’s county permits are likely to be:
- Resident Permits - £325
- Short Term - £150
- Business Permits - £150
- Residents’ visitor permits - £30 for a book of 5 all day tickets

Q: What is the days and times at which controls would apply to the permit holders only scheme?
A: The days and times at which controls would apply to the permit holders only scheme are:
- Resident Permits - 7 days per week
- Short Term Permits - 7 days per week
- Business Permits - 7 days per week
- Residents’ visitor permits - 7 days per week

Q: What is a Permit Holders Only Scheme?
A: A Permit Holders Only Scheme is an area which is only available to permit holders, but which will not apply to non-residents. It is a scheme that will protect on-street parking for the local community against the increasing demands for parking by visitors and commuters, which can be a problem for residents who have to share the available on-street parking. In the past, this has created demand for parking by visitors and commuters, which is a problem for residents who have to share the available on-street parking. Although we are not sure which streets will be covered by a permit holders only scheme at the moment, we are currently considering which streets would be most suitable.

Q: Can residents who are carers park in permit holders only areas?
A: Yes, residents who are carers will be able to park in the area during the hours of operation unless otherwise specified.

Q: What are we hoping to achieve with the “Permit Holders Only” scheme?
A: We are hoping to achieve the following:
- To better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.
- To gather information from local people and the local community to better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.
- To gather information from local people and the local community to better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.

Q: What is the deadline for information regarding the “Permit Holders Only” scheme?
A: The deadline for information regarding the “Permit Holders Only” scheme is 5th April 2013.

Q: How can visitors (including tradesmen) park in permit holders only areas?
A: Visitors and tradesmen will be able to park in permit holders only areas during the hours of operation unless otherwise specified.

Q: During what hours would parking restrictions apply?
A: Parking restrictions will apply to the permit holders only scheme in St Marks Estate.

Q: How are the rights of carers protected?
A: Carers will be able to park in the area during the hours of operation unless otherwise specified.

Q: During what hours would parking restrictions apply?
A: Parking restrictions will apply to the permit holders only scheme in St Marks Estate.

Q: What happens next?
A: The consultation has now ended.

Q: What is the deadline for information regarding the “Permit Holders Only” scheme?
A: The deadline for information regarding the “Permit Holders Only” scheme is 5th April 2013.

Q: How can visitors (including tradesmen) park in permit holders only areas?
A: Visitors and tradesmen will be able to park in permit holders only areas during the hours of operation unless otherwise specified.

Q: What are we hoping to achieve with the “Permit Holders Only” scheme?
A: We are hoping to achieve the following:
- To better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.
- To gather information from local people and the local community to better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.
- To gather information from local people and the local community to better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.

Q: What is the deadline for information regarding the “Permit Holders Only” scheme?
A: The deadline for information regarding the “Permit Holders Only” scheme is 5th April 2013.

Q: How can visitors (including tradesmen) park in permit holders only areas?
A: Visitors and tradesmen will be able to park in permit holders only areas during the hours of operation unless otherwise specified.

Q: What are we hoping to achieve with the “Permit Holders Only” scheme?
A: We are hoping to achieve the following:
- To better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.
- To gather information from local people and the local community to better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.
- To gather information from local people and the local community to better understand the local parking issues as a result of its proximity to city centre destinations and the Jewellery Quarter. Both of these areas already have more rigorous parking controls.
The map opposite shows the proposed area which would be included in the St. Marks Permit Holders Scheme. However, this is only a proposal and we really want to hear your ideas and comments.

The proposed scheme is to be for permit holders only (residents and their visitors) as well as local businesses/employers. It is also proposed that there will be some small sections of limited waiting, which are currently in place (e.g., streets to the rear of local businesses/employers) which would not have a permit. Signs informing people of the controls and times of operation would be displayed at all entry points to the scheme with a number of ‘no pausing’ signs located within the area to remind motorists of the restrictions. Not all new lines and symbols will be marked, but the sections for permit holders will not have bases marked out.

We are aware that there are existing parking controls in the area and intend to incorporate these into any scheme that is introduced. However, if you feel that any of the existing controls need changing, please let us know. Further details regarding the potential controls are provided below.

**Questions for Businesses / Employers**

Do you think there is a parking problem in your street? (Please tick one option)

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

If you answered Yes to Q1, do you think any of the following contribute towards the problem? (Please tick any which apply)

[ ] Local workers park on-street
[ ] Vehicles parked by commuters or visitors making onward trips to final destinations outside the St. Marks area
[ ] Vehicles parked in locations which cause problems for other motorists to pass safely
[ ] Vehicles park in locations which affect pedestrians and cyclists
[ ] Other (please use space below)

Please read and consider the information contained on the leaflet before answering the questions below. Alternatively you can respond online at: www.birmingham.gov.uk/stmarksparking

Please consider the information on the leaflet before answering the questions below.

**Questions for Home Owners, Tenants, Landlords**

How many people aged 17+ live at your address?

[ ] 0
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5 or more

How many vehicles are there in your household?

[ ] 0
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5 or more

Do you think the proposed area would help local streets for the local community? (Please tick one option)

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

If you answered Yes to Q5, do you think any of the following could apply to you/your business? (Please tick any which apply)

[ ] Limited Parking for Shoppers/Visitors
[ ] Limited Parking for Workers
[ ] Limited Waiting for Shoppers/Visitors
[ ] Limited Waiting for Workers
[ ] Home Owners (living in your property) who have mobility issues
[ ] Employers with premises in the area

If you ticked Home Owners, then send a letter to the St. Marks parking team and we will provide you with further information on permit parking, alternatively you can respond online at: www.birmingham.gov.uk/stmarksparking

Please consider the information on the leaflet before answering the questions below.

**Questions for Other Bay Designations**

Which Bay Designations do you think would be most appropriate for controls to apply? (Please tick one option)

[ ] Monday – Saturday
[ ] Monday – Friday
[ ] Monday – Saturday
[ ] A short period during the day, which stops all day parking (e.g. 11am – 12 noon)
[ ] All Day (e.g. 8am – 10pm)
[ ] Other (please use space below)

Would you be in favour of a permit holders only scheme for the St. Marks Estate? Please note there would be a charge for permits - see information in leaflet. (Please tick one option)

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

If you answered Yes to Q6, do you think any of the following could be done to address the parking problem? (Please tick any which apply)

[ ] Permit holders would not be guaranteed a place to park but it is likely that it would be easier to find a space. The number of permits issued would also be increased and it may be necessary to undertake the removal of parking bays to allow more parking. (If permit holders are not guaranteed a space it is likely that the number of permits that would be issued would be increased and it is likely that the removal of parking bays would be required to allow more parking.)
[ ] Residents would also be able to purchase single day or multi-day permits which could be displayed to allow their visitors to park on them.

Further information on permit parking, including the current changes for permits, is provided in the FAQ section of this leaflet.

**For Everyone**

In the St.Marks Permit Holders Scheme. However, this is only a proposal and we really want to hear your ideas and comments. Further details regarding the potential controls are provided below.

**Limitations to parking**

In order to provide parking facilities for the various shops located within the western end of King Edward’s Road and to ensure that the existing parking line for each vehicle can be used during the operational hours of the scheme. The proposal will encourage existing line for each vehicle can be used during the operational hours of the scheme. This should encourage a better mix of vehicles within the area and make it easier to find a parking space.

**Yellow Line Restrictions**

Should a scheme go forward, a full assessment of the streets will be made to ensure the restriction time for options to complete at the final scheme.

**Proposed Bay Parking**

Further details regarding the potential controls are provided below.

**Other Day Designations**

The proposal will encourage a better mix of vehicles within the area and make it easier to find a parking space.

The scheme will ensure that the correct need for specific type of parking (e.g., motorcycle bays, bus bananas, PCOs, etc.) are appropriate.

Thank you for taking the time to respond. 5TH APRIL 2013.
## Appendix C. Key Issues by Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Respondents Comments</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acorn Grove</td>
<td>• Request for parking permits.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The solution is residents-only parking.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• People using the estate for parking when going to the NIA.</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shoppers parking on the estate.</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local workers arrive quite early and leave their cars all day.</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Permit parking 0800-1000 only (to allow for visitors to residents).</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not charge for permits.</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Charge only for one.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vehicles park illegal parking.</td>
<td>• Illegal/Inappropriate Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderton Street</td>
<td>• Put double yellow lines in place.</td>
<td>• Illegal/Inappropriate Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cars get blocked in and it is difficult to get the car out.</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Should not have to pay</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking for visitors to residents</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too many cars come into the area and take up spaces.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking restrictions.</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby Close</td>
<td>• Recommendation for parking permits.</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Should not have to pay.</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Numbers of vehicles parked has recently reduced.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased enforcement is required for the present controls.</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Willing to pay for permits.</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking restrictions.</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommendation for parking permits.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Should not have to pay.</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Numbers of vehicles parked has recently reduced.</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased enforcement is required for the present controls.</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Willing to pay for permits.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daley Close</td>
<td>• Double yellow lines.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforce controls.</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free permits for visitors to residents.</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Controls do not need to be in operation for great lengths of time (4 hour period)</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to clear the commuter parking problem.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scheme should only run in an evening or on a weekend when the NIA hold an event.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman Street</td>
<td>• Double yellow lines.</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforce controls.</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free permits for visitors to residents.</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Controls do not need to be in operation for great lengths of time (4 hour period)</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to clear the commuter parking problem.</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scheme should only run in an evening or on a weekend when the NIA hold an event.</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
<td>• Visitor and Shopper (non-resident) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommendation/Request</td>
<td>• Commuter Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| King Edwards Road                      | Parking for 2 hours max.  |
|                                      | - Yellow lines.          |
|                                      | - Better enforcement.    |
|                                      | - Cars park on speed humps and white lines blocking vision. |
|                                      | - People work in the city centre and are parked up here by 7am. |
|                                      | - Introduce parking permits.  |
|                                      | - Too many Council workers are using the road that I live on as a free car park. |
|                                      | - Visitors to residents also block driveways. |
|                                      | - An ambulance would have difficulty getting to some of the elderly residents. |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Illegal/Inappropriate Parking |
|                                      | Commuter Parking         |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Commuter Parking         |
|                                      | Other                    |
|                                      | Illegal/Inappropriate Parking |

| Sherborne Grove                      | A fee to be charged to non residents using local residents’ parking space. |
|                                      | - Parking permits, but without a charge. |
|                                      | - Commuters parking in residents' driveways, gateways, on pavements, obstructing pedestrians' walk way. |
|                                      | - People parking half on half off footpaths, dropped kerbs and yellow lines and blocking people's driveways. |
|                                      | - There isn't any excessive demand for parking spaces around King Edwards from what I can see. |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Illegal/Inappropriate Parking |
|                                      | Illegal/Inappropriate Parking |
|                                      | Other                    |

| St Marks Crescent                    | Provide free permits for the residents and those who don't live in the area should be charged. Residents should not be penalised. |
|                                      | - One free permit should be issued to each household. |
|                                      | - Residents could have permits to give to visitors for a short time. |
|                                      | - Private driveway is used by others to park. |
|                                      | - People who work in the city centre should park in the city centre. |
|                                      | - Scheme policed by traffic wardens. |
|                                      | - Cars parked on both sides of the street reducing clearance to get past. |
|                                      | - Large commercial vehicles on residential parking a major problem. |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
|                                      | Illegal/Inappropriate Parking |
|                                      | Commuter Parking         |
|                                      | Recommendation/Request |
| St Marks Street | • City workers parking then continuing on foot into the centre.  
• Stop people parking on footpaths  
• Double yellow lines, to improve visibility at junctions and bends.  
• Residents and their visitors only between 8am - 4pm would be the best way to correct the parking problems. | • Other  
• Commuter Parking  
• Recommendation/Request  
• Illegal/Inappropriate Parking  
• Recommendation/Request  
• Illegal/Inappropriate Parking  
• Recommendation/Request |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | • There is a warehouse opposite St Marks street and the employers always park there from 7 am.  
• Implementing parking restrictions will ease the problem. Should be initially on trial basis for 12 months and if it works, implement it.  
• St Marks Street's parking demand has reduced.  
• HGV lorries delivering to Hydra Power can block the street then you have the cars attempting to drive down the pavement opposite Hydra Power.  
• Do not charge for parking permits.  
• During over 30 years as a resident of St Marks Street I’ve only had problems parking once.  
• People who live and have cars on St Marks Street are not affected by commuters using the area: they will be parked up overnight before the commuters arrive. Local people with cars who are not in work can come and go easily; the minority who work during the day leave early and return after the commuters have left. | • Other  
• Recommendation/Request  
• Other  
• Other  
• Recommendation/Request  
• Other  
• Other |