

**DRAFT**

# **Parking and Enforcement Plan**

**Draft for consultation**

## **Contents**

Background

- 1 Parking and the community
- 2 The strategic principles of the plan
- 3 The purpose of CPZs
- 4 Parking hierarchy
- 5 Control regimes
- 6 Retail and commercial centres
- 7 Consultation
- 8 Enforcement
- 9 Customer services
- 10 Implementation
- 11 Management
- 12 Finance
- 13 Monitoring

Stephen Chorley  
For the London Borough of Southwark Council

24 January 2005

## Background

This is the first comprehensive review of parking policy in the borough for a number of years. Comprehensive parking controls were first introduced in Southwark over 30 years ago. Since then they have been extended to cover 40% of the households in the borough, and waiting restrictions have been introduced to many other main roads and junctions.

Parking matters to us all every day. And with the increase in the pressure of street-space, the increase in the number of vehicles on our streets and new demands for clear bus routes and cycle routes it has become one of the most contentious issues in managing our streets.

This report is a response to this wide public interest in the issue. It presents a broad stock-taking of parking policy in the borough. It proposes a new strategic framework, and includes a number of points for action to improve levels of service and facilities together with proposals for more focused reviews on specific issues. It is hoped that the plan will also raise the level of public appreciation of the ways in which control over parking serves a wide range of community interests.

The Plan meets the requirement of Transport for London (TfL) for a Parking and Enforcement Plan to be submitted together with a statement of the Borough's overall transport policy in the form of a Local Improvement Plan (LIP).

The European Parking Congress held in London in October 2003 declared that (extracts):

*“making the most of our parking policies and operations is essential for healthy and vital cities in the future. Parking policies are:*

- *integral parts of transport and traffic policies*
- *essential to support accessibility and economic growth*
- *critical for the management of our urban areas*

*Parking policies must also consider their impact on the environment and ensure that they are contributing to a future that is sustainable over the long term.*

*Above all, any approach to planning and operating parking must be recognised as a partnership matter with many stakeholders involved, whether they have an indirect or direct interest and whether from the private or public sectors.”*

This Parking and Enforcement Plan has been drawn up in the spirit of this international declaration.

# 1 Parking and the community

## What are the problems tackled by this plan?

Many households in Southwark do not have access to a car or a van – 52% in 2001. For these households efficient public transport and ease of walking and cycling is a high priority.

But parking has a vital place in the lives of everyone – even for those who do not have direct access to a car or van:

- We want to park our cars near to where we live
- Many businesses such as shops and local services value the opportunity for their customers and suppliers being able to park near to their premises
- Health workers and carers – both professionals and friends and relatives – need to be able to park near to where the people they are looking after live
- Builders and service contractors need to park near where they are carrying out work
- Many people – some would argue too many - use their cars to get to work and want somewhere to park near to where they work
- Key facilities such as hospitals and higher education institutions attract visitors who want to park nearby
- The Borough's tourist attractions create a demand for parking for both cars and coaches

If parking is not controlled it can become a problem for everyone:

- At pressure points indiscriminate parking may result in obstruction slowing down all traffic and producing 'grid-lock' in busy streets
- Parking in the wrong place is unsafe: it obstructs views and requires both drivers and other road users – cyclists, pedestrians, people with a disability – to put themselves at risk as they negotiate the parked vehicles
- Uncontrolled parking results in a free-for-all in popular locations in which those who have the greatest need for parking – local residents, people with a disability, essential workers and carers, local businesses who need for parking for customers and deliveries – may be squeezed out by 'longstay' parking by visitors, for whom parking their vehicle is a convenience not a necessity

Since comprehensive parking controls were first introduced in the early 1970s the pressure has built up dramatically. The number of vehicles on our streets has grown to the point where it is not possible to meet all demands. There is simply not sufficient space on the roads in many parts of the borough. In 2001 residents in the borough had access to over to 63,000 cars or vans - over twice as many as in 1971. The reasons are that there are more households, and more households have access to a car or a van. There has also been some increase in the proportion of households with more than two cars, though this is a less significant factor.

## The parking control toolbox

This increasing pressure has resulted changes in parking control. When comprehensive regulations were first introduced the objective was to control the impact of parking on the immediate area in which the controls were located. The 'toolbox' of controls was limited to:

- Waiting and loading restrictions
- Designated short stay parking bays – either free limited period parking or charged using meters to encourage a higher turnover and to make enforcement easier
- Systems of permits associated with designated areas for residents and other priority users
- Direct provision of off-street parking and controls through the planning system over development which required minimum levels of off-street parking.

Transport and development strategies now recognise that the incessant rise in the demand for travel by road cannot be met within the road system without an unsustainable level of congestion and an unacceptable impact on the safety and environment of all other users of our roads. 27% of trips to work in the borough in 2001 were by car. 30% of residents of the borough who travelled to work by car went no further than the borough boundary, and 12% did not travel beyond their ward. As a result transport strategies have refocused on

- managing the demand for travel by private vehicles by a combination or deterrents, the most notable of which is the Congestion Charge, and investment in faster and more comfortable public transport. Travel planning has been introduced both for organisations and individuals to encourage changes in lifestyles which reduce dependence on the car.
- managing street-space as a safe and pleasant environment for all users, including pedestrians and cyclists and residents and other occupiers of properties affected by road traffic
- supporting economic and social activities: for example by improving access by all means of transport (by car, but also on foot, by bi-cycle and by public transport) to retail, leisure and other business premises, to community facilities such as hospitals and health centres and to points of access to public transport

Parking regulation has played a major role in putting these new approaches into practice. The original 'toolbox' has been updated:

- Waiting and loading restrictions remain the starting point, but they are now closely linked to other ways of controlling the use of street-space: bus lanes, cycle lanes, 'shared use' streets, and traffic calming features
- Meter charges have been restructured, reducing maximum hours or increasing the charge for longer stay parking (often reversing previous charge structures) – this has been assisted by the replacement of individual meters by pay and display systems which offer greater flexibility and convenience
- Permit systems have been extended to provide parking priority to a wider range of essential service providers and greater opportunities for people with a disability

But more significantly, the objectives and scope of parking regulation has been broadened. Parking regulation has become one of the ways in which unnecessary

trips by private vehicle are discouraged to tackle the root causes of congestion and the impact of traffic on the environment:

- on and off-street parking for visitors to an area may be restricted to 'short-stay' parking (less than 4 hours, or even shorter periods in areas where there is intense demand) to encourage high turnover in parking spaces to support economic and social functions, to prevent blocking of available spaces by all day visitors including local workers, and as an active disincentive to commuting to work by car
- control over new development has moved from requiring minimum levels of off-street parking provision to maximum levels
- parking controls have been extended beyond areas in which local congestion is the primary issue to other areas where there are concentrations of employment, or locations such as railway stations, tube stations, and major by corridors which are used by commuters as informal 'park and ride' facilities
- facilities have been introduced to provide designated parking for 'car clubs' (in residential areas) and 'car share' schemes (in destination areas)
- environmental objectives have been supported through reduced permit charges for alternative fuel vehicles

At the same time, methods of enforcement have changed to match the changes in traffic volumes and the increasing scope of restrictions:

- the most significant change was 'de-criminalisation' of enforcement – shifting enforcement from the Police to local authorities and replacing court proceedings to impose penalties with 'Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs)
- Parking Attendants have become more mobile, and have at their disposal hand-held computers which provide direct communications with central controllers
- CCTV surveillance has been introduced into some of the busiest streets

## The objectives of parking regulation

Parking regulation is now linked to wider transport social and economic policy objectives. The objectives of this plan are derived from the Borough's Community Strategy:

Community Strategy theme	Objectives for parking strategy
Tackling poverty	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support regeneration of the borough and the vitality of local employment and business centres through appropriate parking arrangements</li> <li>2. Provide adequate parking facilities for people with a disability which makes them dependent of transport in private vehicles</li> </ol>
Making Southwark Cleaner and Greener	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Encourage travellers to use means of transport other than cars, by keeping public transport moving and discouraging long stay parking in 'destination' areas</li> <li>4. Encourage the use of less polluting vehicles</li> <li>5. Make car parking and its associated signage less obtrusive within the streetscape</li> </ol>
Cutting crime and the fear of crime	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Enforce parking regulations firmly but fairly</li> <li>7. Ensure that the emergency services are not obstructed when attending emergencies</li> </ol>
Raising the standards in our schools	<i>No directly relevant parking aim</i>
Improving the health of the borough	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Promote safer streets through control over hazardous and obstructive parking</li> <li>9. Facilitate access by emergency services, health workers and carers</li> <li>10. Assist free passage for pedestrians and cyclists</li> </ol>

## The strategic principles of the plan

### The development of controls in Southwark

Comprehensive parking controls now cover 40% of households in the Borough.

Historically CPZs have been introduced in a number of phases which have reflected an evolving strategy:

- **Town and city centre areas:** Zones C (later split into C1 and C2), D (city centre area and Peckham) were introduced in the early 1970s to control parking in the major 'town centres'.
- **Sequential extensions to Walworth and Camberwell:** Zones E and J were introduced in the late 1990s to cope with spillover from the central area zones around the Elephant and Castle. They were followed by M1 in 2001. Zones K and L (Camberwell) were introduced in 2000 to manage parking in the vicinity of Kings hospital and the retail centre of Camberwell.
- **Jubilee Line:** Zones F, G, H and N were introduced in 1999 to prevent all day commuter parking in the vicinity of the new Jubilee line stations. Zone F has since been the scene of extensive office development
- **Congestion Charge:** The most recent zones, GR, SB, T (Grange and Bermondsey), M2 (South Walworth) and HH (Herne Hill) were introduced to cope with the anticipated pressure on areas around key rail stations and major bus routes following the introduction of the congestion charge.

The regimes in each CPZ have developed over time. But the underlying principle has been that the regime should be broadly the same for all CPZs.

### Taking stock

In recent years the council has undertaken initial surveys for zones in a number of other areas. The results have been mixed. This possibly reflects growing resistance by the public to CPZs. It may also reflect a lack of clarity about the overall strategy once areas in which there was intense competition for street space between residents and visitors had been covered by CPZs.

Analysis of supply and demand within existing CPZs (set out in a supplementary report) also indicates that pressures on available parking space vary significantly suggesting that a 'one size fits' all approach to the CPZ regime may not be appropriate – a point which has regularly been reflected in public attitudes to parking controls. Major differences include:

- The CPZs in the city centre are, Camberwell and Peckham perform the traditional function of managing parking in areas of intense demand and protecting residents' and other local interests
- In other areas the function there appears to be sufficient parking to meet demand, and the primary function of parking controls is to restrict long stay parking by commuters.

The analysis also indicates that parking controls may not be performing effectively in supporting local economic and social activities. The level of use made of meter

spaces appears to be low in most areas – the exceptions are areas in the vicinity of the two major hospitals, Guys near London Bridge, and Kings in Camberwell. This suggests that the visitor spaces are not located where they are readily accessible to local businesses and community facilities. The use of the largest publicly operated off-street car park, the multi-story facility in Peckham, is also low, and there is are regular complaints that free limited waiting bays near to business premises provided for customers and other business visitors are regularly ‘blocked’ by long term parking.

### **New strategic principles for parking control**

Reflecting this analysis and the review of the functions of parking regulation in the previous section it is proposed that the objectives of the PEP should be translated into action on the basis of the following strategic principles:

The **purpose** of each CPZ and other parking controls should be defined in relation to local circumstances in the context of the Council’s wider development and transport plans (Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 10)

Priority for available parking space should be based on a clear **hierarchy** of road users including pedestrians, cyclists and people with a disability (Objectives 1, 2, 9 and 10)

The **regime** applied, geographical extent and detailed design of CPZs and other controls should fit the designated purpose and wider objectives of sustainability (Objectives 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10)

Parking regulations in the vicinity of **retail and business centres and community facilities** should be designed to support their operations and more generally the continued vitality of ‘town centres’ throughout the Borough (Objective 1)

**Consultation** on review of current regulations and proposed changes should be based on a clear strategic framework as the context for evaluating the views of local residents, businesses and other local organisations (Objectives 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8)

**Enforcement** should be firm but fair and aim to secure the underlying purpose of parking controls: safety for all road users, the free flow of traffic, particularly public transport, maintenance of access for all road users and essential and emergency services, protecting the interests of residents and local businesses and other organisations, and maintaining a regular turnover in parking spaces which are intended to support local business and other social activities (Objectives 1, 6, 8, 9 and 10)

A commitment to clear **standards** of enforcement and customer services, and a high level of public information on both services and policy (Objectives 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10)

## The purpose of CPZs

### *Strategic principle:*

*The purpose of each CPZ and other parking controls should be defined in relation to local circumstances in the context of the Council's wider development and transport plans (Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 10)*

### **Criteria for introducing or maintaining existing controls**

In applying the strategic principle above to reviewing or introducing CPZs and other parking controls the following criteria will be adopted:

Schemes linked to **road safety** measures including schemes in the vicinity of schools and other community facilities

Reduction of **congestion** caused by parking, in particular to improve the efficiency of bus routes

Protection of **local occupiers' interests** in areas where there is pressure **all day from visitors** to specific destinations (such as hospitals, town centres, employment concentrations and points of access to public transport) or periodic or evening pressure for parking for special events or specific periods (including football grounds, places of worship, and major leisure venues)

Areas where there is a need to manage parking in the interests of the **local business community and other local organisations**, particularly in 'Opportunity Areas' and 'town centres' as designated in the UPD

CPZs linked to UDP 'Action Areas' where **high density development** is being introduced

Areas where controls will help to **discourage commuting** to work by car irrespective of the amount of street-space available for parking in the area

Areas in which there are specific **safety or access problems**, including footway parking and inappropriate parking of lorries and areas where there is a high proportion of terraced dwellings converted into flats (subject to detailed survey) resulting in general access difficulties

### **Implications for existing and future areas**

Currently, comprehensive parking controls in Southwark (see Maps at end of this section) embrace:

- the major concentrations of employment in the City Centre (within the Congestion Zone area), Peckham, Walworth Road, much of the employment zones off the Old Kent Road, Camberwell and Peckham (CPZs B,C ^^^^)
- the major retail and business centres in the Borough, Peckham and Walworth Road/Elephant and Castle, much of the Old Kent Road and the 'district centres' at Camberwell (CPZs ^^^^)
- most of the major visitor attractions, particularly the central 'cultural zone' including facilities such as the Tate Modern, the Globe Theatre, the War Museum and the London Dungeon, and the major hospitals (Guys in the central area and Kings in Camberwell) (CPZs ^^^^)

- railhead areas at Herne Hill, Peckham, Surrey Quays and Canada Warf as well as the tube stations in the city centre area and the major bus corridors of Walworth Road/Camberwell Road and the Old Kent Road ( CPZs ^^^)
- areas potentially attractive for with commuter parking in which there appear to be no general pressures on street-space for parking (CPZs ^^^)

Waiting restrictions which are not incorporated into CPZs have been introduced progressively elsewhere to:

- all bus routes
- local shopping parades and smaller centres throughout the borough
- areas in the vicinity of schools and other community facilities where there is a concentration of pedestrian activity
- junctions and pedestrian crossing points where uncontrolled waiting forms a safety hazard
- wider area safety schemes and 'home zones'

Areas where there may be a case for additional comprehensive parking controls include:

- Queens Road, Nunhead, East Dulwich, West Dulwich and Sydenham Hill stations – but the extent of the pressure in these areas has not been recently surveyed (all day visitor pressure)
- Peckham road/ Southampton road in the vicinity of the council offices (employment centre, discourage commuting by car)
- The Lordship Lane retail area (support local businesses)
- Parts of East Dulwich, North Camberwell and Peckham Rye (where the volume of on-street parking has increased to the point where it has the potential to restrict access for general road users, including emergency vehicles and other essential services)

## **Review**

The Council also maintains a running list of 'hotspots' – specific location both within and outside CPZs at which parking controls require to be tightened to tackle specific points of congestion or local safety hazards.

The review programme set out in section ^^ below will review all existing and possible future CPZs and other controls against the criteria set out above, and lead to specific proposals for adjustments in existing controls or new controls.

## **Maps**

Current CPZs

CPZs and visitor attractions

Employment concentrations and CPZs

Concentrations of house conversions and CPZs

## Parking hierarchy

### *Strategic principle*

*Priority for available parking space should be based on a clear hierarchy of road users including pedestrians, cyclists and people with a disability (Objectives 1, 2, 9 and 10)*

In their guidance on the application of parking controls the Government recommend that authorities should apply a 'parking hierarchy' which aims to reflect the new range of policy priorities. The hierarchy which will be applied in implementing the strategic principles of this plan is set out below.

It will, however, be applied with regard to the circumstances in each area. For example, in areas where there is very limited space for residents parking the needs of essential public workers and care workers may need to be given equal priority. And in commercial area, higher priority is generally given to short stay parking in areas adjacent or very near to business premises.

<b>Parking hierarchy</b>	
Road users	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ local disabled resident parking need</li><li>▪ non-local disabled parking need</li><li>▪ local resident parking need</li><li>▪ essential worker in the delivery of public service and carers</li><li>▪ local business essential parking/servicing need</li><li>▪ short-stay shopper/visitor parking need</li><li>▪ long-stay shopper/visitor parking need</li><li>▪ long-stay commuter parking need</li></ul>
Vehicle Type	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ emergency vehicle</li><li>▪ cycle</li><li>▪ bus</li><li>▪ public service vehicle</li><li>▪ taxi</li><li>▪ shared/pool car</li><li>▪ cleaner/greener private car</li><li>▪ powered two-wheeler</li><li>▪ conventional private car</li></ul>

## Control regimes

### *Strategic principle*

*The regime applied, geographical extent and detailed design of CPZs and other controls should fit the designated purpose and wider objectives of sustainability (Objectives 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10)*

### **Regimes within CPZs**

The current 'one size fits all' approach will be progressively replaced by a range of core regimes which will enable the council to match control regimes to the purpose of introducing controls. There will be six 'core' regimes, although their application will be subject to local variations:

	<b>Period of control</b>	<b>Level of charges</b>	<b>Restricted or open bays</b>	<b>Application to current zones</b>
Central Zone	7 days All day	Top level charges (meters and permits)	Segregated bays	C1, C2, D, F
Commuter and business areas	5 days 2 hours	Low level charges	Shared use bays	G, GR, SB, TR, H, N, HH
Town centre area	6 days Business hours	Low level charges	See main text	E, J, M1, M2, B
High density residential areas	7 days Daytime hours	Medium level for permits Low level for meters	Segregated bays	K, L
Council estates	7 days Daytime hours	Low level charges	Segregated bays	n/a
Special purpose	As appropriate	Nil charges	n/a	None

A schedule of charges is set out in Table ^ (at end of Section) to illustrate how they might be structured. This detailed schedule is not, however, put forward for approval at this stage. The detailed proposals will be subject to separate consultation following adoption of this plan. A detailed assessment of the implications for enforcement, the costs and potential income from the changes suggested, and other operational issues will also be undertaken, including an assessment of the experience of authorities elsewhere in operating features which would be new to Southwark.

### **Geographic size of CPZs**

There are significant variations in the geographic size of the existing CPZs. This leads to significant differences in the opportunity to take car trips within the zone of residence and the extent of privileged parking opportunities for residents and local businesses.

The differences are to some extent historical, although they also reflect the results of public consultations and the differences in the problems which required to be tackled at the time.

Government advice is that zones should be quite small in order to reduce the level of travel by car within the borough's boundaries. Very local travel forms a significant proportion of all travel in the borough (see para ^^) suggesting that this would help

to reduce congestion in the borough resulting from car use for very short trips. But other boroughs have opted for single zone approaches to increase the range of opportunities for visiting local shops and businesses.

A balance has to be struck. The following principles will be applied progressively in determining the size of CPZs in the borough:

Zones should be designed to discourage the use of cars for short trips (less than 1 km) to sources of employment or facilities such as shops. This also means avoiding 'mixed use' zones (this may not be practical everywhere)

Predominantly residential areas should generally be relatively large, to provide maximum choice for both residents and visitors, but non residential zones should generally be drawn tightly to discourage commuter parking

Very small zones may be appropriate at specific pressure points such as the streets around stations and hospitals.

The current zones do not conform consistently to these principles.

### **CPZs – physical layout principles**

The council applies standards recommended by the Department of Transport and other recognized authorities. But it does not currently have a set of design principles which should be applied consistently in all CPZs. As a consequence the way in which the details of CPZs are drawn up is not always clear. Design principles will include:

the definition of boundaries to minimise immediate displacement effects

maximization of the number of parking spaces available consistent with safety, other needs and the objectives of the CPZ

a balance between residents and business bays, longer stay meter bays and short-stay bays (free or metered) based on numbers of residents' vehicles, specific visitor attractors and numbers of businesses in the area

meter spaces distributed throughout zones, with very short-stay spaces located close to business premises (within the constraints of the overall balance between different types of spaces) – see also next section

provision in all zones for car clubs and car share schemes (see para<sup>^^</sup> above)

provision of loading and unloading spaces, in the form of yellow line drop-off points (see paras <sup>^^</sup> and <sup>^^</sup> for provision of designated loading bays)

restrictions at junctions to ensure safety without unnecessarily restricting the amount of parking available

provision of passing gaps, particularly in streets with extensive parking bays on both sides where there is insufficient width for vehicles to pass

Waiting and loading restrictions outside CPZs will be drawn up to take account of:

The width of the carriageway and traffic levels

The presence of bus lanes

In streets where there are shopping parades off peak loading bays will generally be provided on the principle road or at the end of side streets

In residential streets the aim will be to retain the maximum possible number of parking spaces

These principles are consistent with loading and waiting restrictions applied by TfL on 'Red Routes.'

An independent Safety Audit will be undertaken for all new schemes or major modifications of existing controls.

### **Development control and off-street parking**

The application of the maximum parking standards set out in the UDP will take into account the following issues to ensure that development control is applied consistently with the strategic principles for parking controls set out in this plan:

For larger high density residential developments where there is a significant potential for spillover into adjacent streets Planning Agreements should include an acceptance by developers that householders will not be able to obtain parking permits. Such developments should only be located where there are adequate controls over parking in adjacent streets (the only area identified for high density development with restricted levels of off-street parking which is not within a current CPZ is Rotherhithe)

In applying maximum residential standards, the level of provision should not be 'averaged' over more than one development (unless they are linked through planning agreements).

The potential demand for parking by future residents should be assessed realistically. The number of totally 'car-free' developments should be assessed in relation to the overall balance of residential properties and parking provision within the locality (300m centred on the development).

Commercial developments proposing to provide less than the maximum permitted parking spaces for the area should be assessed in relation to the amount and intensity of demand for off-street parking in the vicinity of the development (300m).

Where it is considered that off-street parking in town centre areas above the maximum standards can be justified for specific developments such as superstores, in accordance with the principles set out above, it should as far as is practical be available for general public use.

### **Range of permits available**

The range of permits currently available are set out in Table ^ (at end of Section).

A number of modifications have been suggested on which no decision has yet been taken. These are detailed in Table ^ (at end of Section). It is recommended that a full assessment of the arguments for and against each is undertaken, together with further consultation and a comparison with arrangements in other boroughs

## Disability issues

Southwark provides dedicated parking bays throughout the borough. These are provided at locations such as town centres and other popular destinations and where requested by registered disabled people who have access to a car. Set criteria are used for assessing whether they can be provided safely and without excessive disruption to traffic on busy streets

Blue badge holders may also park on yellow lines for up to 3 hours (where loading and unloading is permitted and as long as they are not causing an obstruction), and in meter bays. Blue badge holders are not currently permitted to park in residents' bays in CPZs.

Following a recent review consideration is being given to the following improvements

Parking by blue badge holders in residents' parking areas, or the introduction of shared use bays (where parking by disabled people is also permitted)

A review of the distribution of dedicated bays throughout the borough (which might include a reduction in areas where parking is permitted in residents' or shared use bays)

Additional badges which include the user's car number for use overnight outside a disabled person's house – there is a high risk of theft of Blue badges, which do not contain the car registration number

24 hour 'on call' enforcement to help prevent misuse of dedicated bays

Inclusion of disability issues in induction training for PAs to ensure that enforcement is carried out in a way which is sensitive to the needs of people with a disability

:

## Coaches

The area attracts a number of tourist coaches to sites within the Cultural Zone (mainly within the Central Activity Area). These include the Tate Modern, the London Dungeon, the Imperial War Museum and the Globe Theatre. A significant proportion of coaches carry school parties and others for whom travel by public transport is not a practical option. There are also some commuter services which terminate within the borough.

Until recently there was a large coach park at a derelict site on the southern approach to Tower Bridge. This provided a waiting up area for a wider area of London. Development pressure has resulted in the closure of this site. But it was not particularly well used – it was either not well enough known or too far from many popular dropping off points within central London. Experience at this site demonstrates the difficulty in providing locations for waiting up which will be used by coaches in practice.

Coach bays are currently provided in Zones C1, C2, D and F with a total of approximately 33 bays (10 each in Zones C1, C2 and D and 3 in F).

Levels of demand have not been surveyed recently, and it is unknown if there is a general shortage of spaces. But it is also clear that the provision of coach parking serves interests which extend beyond the borough. It is therefore recommended that the development of policies for coach parking should be taken forward by TfL on the basis of a review of supply and demand within the South East sector of London.

### Off street parking

Provision of off-street parking by the Council has never been substantial in Southwark. Private sector provision is more substantial, but all the major car parks are located within the city centre area.

Council	Choumert Grove	Surface	Mon - Sat	60p/hr	120 spaces
Council	Copeland Road	Surface	Mon - Sat	60p/hr	60 spaces
Council	Peckham TC	Multi-storey	Mon - Sat	60p/hr	360 spaces
Council	Stead Str	Surface	Mon - Fri	2hrs £1.00 3hrs £2.00 All day £5.00	120 spaces
NCP	E and C	Multi-storey		£2.00 /hr £14.00 all day	
NCP	Kipling Str	Multi-storey		£2.00 /hr £11.00 all day	
NCP	Library Str	Multi-storey		£2.00 /hr £8.00 all day	
Qpark	Butlers Warf	Multi-storey		£2,50 /hr £11.00 all day	

Together with private non-residential parking these off-street facilities appear to be sufficient to accommodate current levels of travel to work into the central areas by car. Further tightening of controls to discourage commuting by car is likely to be difficult without activating powers available to TfL to charge for non-residential off-street parking.

The regime operating in Council car parks will be brought within the 'core' CPZ regimes set out above and their contribution to maintaining the vitality of the local retail and business communities which they serve (see next section).

### Powered two wheelers

Bays for solo motorcycles are provided in all zones except HH, M2, N and T. In 'destination' areas where there are dedicated bays there is no meter charge. (CHECK)

Discounted residents permits are available in six Zones. These include three recent Zones, HH, M2, and T, where there are no dedicated bays. The borough has been planning to adjust all Zones to permitting motorcycle parking in general residents' bays at a reduced charge.

No recent survey has been carried out on the adequacy of supply of bays in either residential or destinations areas.

### **Streetscene, pavement parking, crossovers**

The council is currently tendering for a partner to assist in setting new design principles for the streetscene. This will cover all types of road furniture including parking fixtures and lining. The aim will be to produce standards and guidelines which form an integrated design framework which reflects the character and function of different types of areas. This can help to reduce unsightly clutter of signs and lining, whilst leaving members of the public with a clear understanding of where parking is or not permissible.

Such treatment is likely, however, to be costly, and could only be rolled out over the borough progressively over a period of years. In the meantime shorter term action will be considered to reduce the impact of the most inappropriate areas of clutter.

The contractors will be required to draw up standards and guidance consistent with TfL's recently published manual.

Pavement parking is generally forbidden. Designations of locations where it is permitted have been used sparingly.

The Council's policy on pavement crossovers is currently to permit them where they can be provided safely. This has not to date resulted in a proliferation of 'front garden' parking in areas where they are inappropriate within the streetscape – generally in older areas in Southwark where this might otherwise be a problem the front gardens are too restricted for the construction of a driveway. CHECK THIS OUT

### **Environmental incentives**

Discounted residents' permits for alternative fuel efficient vehicles are currently available in the most recently introduced CPZs. Vehicles must be eligible for a Powershift grant. These are available for conversion to LPG, electric and 'hybrid' powered vehicles. These types of vehicles are eligible for a 75% discount.

A further incentive could be introduced to encourage the use of more fuel efficient vehicles. This could be based on the level of carbon dioxide emissions as used for determining the level of company car tax. A break point of 200 Gm per km would include most smaller, more 'city-friendly' vehicles. The discount level available could be less than the full discount available for alternative fuel vehicles (see also illustrative regimes table in Table ^). Claiming the discount would require the presentation of the vehicles registration document (or, for this purpose only, a copy of the document). An engine capacity limit of 2 litres could be applied to older vehicles for which emissions data is not contained in registration documents (such vehicles will generally exceed the suggested emissions limit, but a lower limit might discriminate unfairly against older vehicles).

## **Database of regulations**

The council has a database register of all Traffic Management Orders, together with a full Library of Orders. But these Orders have only been consolidated when the opportunity has arisen. As a result it can be difficult to establish the definitive regulatory provisions for a specific location. There are also variations in the details of exceptions provided for in the Orders for similar circumstances. It is planned to register the details of all Orders on a database as the basis for consolidation and rationalisation.

All CPZs have been documented on a GIS map base. This is largely complete, but the map base has not been subject to a full quality and accuracy review. There are also inconsistencies in the way in which information is held for each area.

Once the database and maps have been reviewed they will provide a valuable tool to assist the review and development of policy and the management of enforcement and could also be of interest to the public if made available through the council's web site.

## Retail and commercial centres

### *Strategic principle*

*Parking regulations in the vicinity of retail and business centres and community facilities should be designed to support their operations and more generally the continued vitality of 'town centres' throughout the Borough (Objective 1)*

Within the context of the parking regimes set out in the previous section a range of measures will be considered to support businesses in town centres. The application of these measures will be tailored to the requirements of each town centre. Each town centre in Southwark is distinct in its business composition, the availability of off-street parking, and the areas they serve. A balance needs to be struck in all centres between the interest of businesses in maintaining access by car and the potential for encouraging customers and business suppliers to make greater use of public transport. Specific surveys of the dependence on car access will be considered.

The measures will include:

Very short stay parking at metered bays, possibly at a low cost, to encourage maximum use of limited parking space

Limited provision of short stay off-street parking based on the overall needs of the town centre loading bays and where possible rear servicing

Voluntary agreement on managing loading times drawn up by Town Centre Managers, possibly linked to schemes promoted through Freight Quality Partnership

A longer discretionary period for loading in a no-waiting areas, where this is feasible without excessive disruption of bus lanes (this may require physical modification of kerb-side and pavement areas)

Retailers and other owners of private off-street parking should be encouraged to operate complementary regimes, and make their parking available to the general public for short stay parking

Complementary development control policies (see para^^^)

## Consultation

### *Strategic principle*

*Consultation on reviews of current regulations and proposed changes should be based on a clear strategic framework as the context for evaluating the views of local residents, businesses and other local organisations (Objectives 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8)*

The current practice in introducing a new CPZ is a two stage process. At the first stage a full postal survey is carried out of all known householders and businesses in the area at the initial scheme design stage. This survey will normally be combined with exhibitions in the locality. Respondents are in a position to comment on both the principle of the proposals and the detail. The proposals will normally be taken further if at least 50% of those responding are in favour of a CPZ for the area. If it is clear that there is support from at least 50% of the residents of part of the area, the council may proceed with a smaller CPZ. Amendments to the proposals may also be made to reflect criticisms of the detail.

The second stage is to draw up the Order on the basis of the plan as revised following the survey of residents. Recent CPZs have been introduced using the experimental order procedure. This does not involve any requirement for a formal objections period and possible hearing at this stage. But the Order must be reviewed and re-confirmed within 18 months. At this stage a hearing is held if any objections are received during the experimental period which have not subsequently been withdrawn. (The legal requirement for a hearing relates only to waiting restrictions, but it is the Council's practice to hold hearings on a wider range of substantial points of objection).

Review procedures include a full postal survey of all known residents and businesses. If the council is itself proposing modifications these are drawn up in draft before the survey is undertaken. As with the introduction of new CPZs exhibitions will normally be arranged in the locality.

The overall programme of proposed CPZs has also been open to public consultation within the framework of the council's consultation on its annual transport plans.

It is proposed to reconsider the consultation framework in order to:

- separate questions of community interest from the impact on individual residents or businesses
- Avoid abortive detailed design work
- Avoid the impression that the council has pre-determined its conclusions, whilst at the same time focusing more discussion on issues of community interest

Improved consultation arrangements will be based on the following principles

Two stages of consultation – the first would focus on the principles of introducing a new CPZ (or possibly of retaining a CPZ). At this stage detailed designs would not have been drawn up, and the survey are would generally extend beyond the proposed CPZ area. A second survey would then be carried out on a detailed draft design covering only residents and businesses in the area it is proposed to designate.

At the first stage, results should be analysed by street as well as being aggregated over the whole area. A weighting should also be built in based on the response rate. Generally results should only be considered to be conclusive if at there is a response rate of at least 30%.

In considering the principle of whether a CPZ is required weight may also be given to other objectives for parking strategy as set out in this PEP including support for commercial areas, maintaining essential access and integration with areas based traffic safety measures. Surveys should incorporate questions on attitudes to these and other relevant local issues as well as seeking individual attitudes to the introduction of a CPZ.

## **Enforcement**

### *Strategic principle*

*Enforcement should be firm but fair and aim to secure the underlying purpose of parking controls: safety for all road users, the free flow of traffic, particularly public transport, maintenance of access for all road users and essential and emergency services, protecting the interests of residents and local businesses and other organisations, and maintaining a regular turnover in parking spaces which are intended to support local business and other social activities (Objectives 1, 6, 8, 9 and 10)*

### **Current arrangements**

The whole of the borough has been designated for 'de-criminalised' enforcement of on-street parking and bus lanes. Following the current pilot schemes elsewhere consideration is being given to the utilisation of the extended powers to undertake enforcement of a range of moving traffic offences under legislation introduced in 2003.

All enforcement is contracted out to a private enforcement company (there are four separate contracts, all with one company). The principle enforcement contract is for 10 years, with a five year point at which either side can withdraw without penalty. This point will be reached in 2006, giving an opportunity to re-negotiate the terms of the contract (although no decision has yet been taken to do so). The contract as currently specified requires the contractor to provide the resources necessary for effective enforcement of all regulations throughout the Borough. The contract includes two key quality provisions:

- A bonus payment is made if the number of PCNs issued exceeds 120,000 across the Borough. ( This is not extended to incentive payments for individual attendants.)
- The contractor is penalised if the level of PCNs if the number of PCNs challenged and shown to have been issued in error exceeds 1 in 1,000.

These two provisions taken together are aimed to ensure that the contractor operates a firm but fair approach to enforcement.

Powers which became available in 2001 to use CCTV observation of parking and bus lane offences as the basis for issuing PCNs have been applied at two locations:

- CCTV surveillance has been introduced along the whole of Walworth Road/ Camberwell Road extending from the Crown Court in Newington Causeway to Denmark Hill. This installation was funded by TfL through the London Bus Initiative
- CCTV surveillance was introduced into Rye Lane through the centre of Peckham in 2002. This was funded by the Council itself.

### **Forms of enforcement contract**

Contracts for enforcement vary between those which specify the level of resources to be provided and the frequency of visits to different areas, and those which leave the contractor to manage the allocation of resources to achieve specified outcome

objectives. Both styles have advantages and disadvantages; the former is easy to monitor but takes little or no account of changing circumstances. The latter is more difficult to monitor but can react swiftly to changes in the location or level of parking problems. Either form of contract can have incentives for success or penalties for failure.

Arrangements also vary between the 'styles' of enforcement. Recent press criticism of enforcement arrangements elsewhere led to some authorities modifying or removing incentive payments, particularly incentive for individual attendants, and requiring a more conciliatory approach. The Southwark concept is that to achieve the objective of improved traffic flow and safety the aim should be to change the pattern of driver behaviour and focus on shifting inappropriately parked vehicles by providing convenient alternatives.

The British Parking Association has recently published a new 'model' contract for enforcement. Whilst it retains a system of financial bonuses and penalties for performance it makes provision for a broad range of performance indicators. These are aggregated up into single composite performance measures. The model contract prohibits bonuses for individual parking attendants. The suggested bonus and penalty scheme provides, however, for a more substantial fluctuation in income based on performance, measured at more frequent time periods than the current contract in Southwark.

### **Enforcement activity**

The objective of enforcement is to support the objectives of parking controls: that is the prevention of obstructions and compliance with the arrangements for managing access to limited parking space. There is no general evidence that levels of traffic obstruction or abuse of parking management arrangements are higher in Southwark than elsewhere. But these have not been directly monitored.

It is proposed to appoint two monitoring officers to undertake surveys of the proportion of observed infringements which are subject to enforcement action. In the meantime the only indicator of the level of enforcement activity is the number of PCNs issued. An analysis of PCNs has been carried out, from which indicates that:

- Over 70% of PCNs are issued for offences relating to yellow lines, bus lane and pavement parking – offences relating to permits and meters make up a significantly smaller proportion at 20%
- CCTV surveillance, which targets yellow line and bus lane offences, has been effective
- Zone A – mainly yellow line and bus lane offences outside CPZs – and the roads covered by CCTV account for 44% of the total PCNs issued
- The bulk of other PCNs issued relate to the principle 'town centres' - Peckham and the Central Activity Zone

The analysis also considered comparisons with other Inner London Boroughs. But this is inconclusive because of the wide range of variations in circumstances which could be expected to affect levels of infringements of parking controls.

The effectiveness of enforcement and public respect for parking controls also depend on how Parking Attendants apply the regulations. They need to be firm – they cannot apply unlimited discretion. But at the same time enforcement action should be proportionate to the severity of the infringement. Generally traffic offences involving parking on yellow lines or in bus lanes have the potential to cause an immediate traffic hazard or congestion. Permit offences and meter offences have a less immediate impact – they are more about ensuring that drivers are responsible in observing parking management arrangements which have been introduced in the wider interests of the whole community. The proportion of PCNs issued for ‘yellow line’ and bus lane infringements indicates that current enforcement activity is well focused on more serious infringements.

A secondary indicator of whether enforcement activity is generally fair is the level of challenge and appeal against PCNs issued. Around 12% of PCNs issued in 2003/04 were cancelled at various stages – around three quarters because owners could not be traced, and most of the rest on the basis of information supplied at each stage in following up the PCNs. The rate of cancellations due to contractor error or following representations in Southwark were both small – 0.6% and 3.7% respectively. Representations which are accepted by the Council generally contain information which could not have been available to the Parking Attendant when the PCN was issued. 1% of PCNs were subject to a formal appeal to the Adjudication service, 60% of which were upheld, adding a further 0.6% to the number of cancellations. The only comparisons which can be made with other authorities is in the levels of formal appeals. But variations cannot be considered to be statistically significant, and are more likely to reflect different practices in considering representations prior to formal appeals being heard – and no comparisons are available on levels of cancellation at this earlier stage.

Whilst the Council considers that its current enforcement arrangements are generally ‘firm but fair’ it is recognised that there is always scope for improvement. It is planned to:

- appoint two contract monitoring officers
- Re-negotiate the current contract at the mid-term break point to build in more explicitly a wider range of performance measures, and an explicit facility for council officers to set priorities which reflect wider transport objectives and reported concerns of the public

## **Meters and use of new technology**

### *Communication with Parking Attendants*

All Parking Attendants have handheld computers for recording offences and issuing tickets. These now have GPS positioning systems. This offers the potential for monitoring the beats covered, and detailed analysis of hotspots which could be used in targeting enforcement activity and identifying areas where waiting controls are unsatisfactory.

### *Meters*

Individual ‘stalk’ meters are being progressively replaced by pay and display meters. Meters throughout the Borough are subject to regular vandalism. In common with

experience elsewhere pay and display meters are targeted less frequently than single bay meters.

All new meters are solar powered. All meters will be connected to a central information point by <sup>^^^</sup>. This will enable the contractors to identify faults and vandalism remotely.

Networked meters also provide the potential to introduce other payment facilities including payment by credit or debit card, electronic pre-payment cards, and payment by mobile phone. No evaluation of the potential for such systems in Southwark has been carried out to date. They would have the advantage of reduced cash handling. As a result of providing more ways for the public to pay there might be some increase in the level of payment. These technologies are all relatively new, and experience in other areas is still being evaluated.

The Council's surface and multi-story car parks are operated using pay and display machines. 'Pay on foot' ticket issuing equipment combined with exit barriers have been found to be generally effective elsewhere – it is not possible to leave without payment for a ticket. But the capital and maintenance costs are substantial, and they are unlikely to be appropriate for the car parks in Southwark, which are small or, in the case of the multi-story, have low usage.

## *CCTV*

CCTV surveillance has been successful at two locations, and consideration is being given to its extension. Monitoring is carried out by the enforcement contractor. All installations currently in use are fixed.

An option to extend CCTV surveillance to 24 hours 7 days a week has been evaluated. It appears that this would be cost effective as well as providing higher levels of enforcement. During the quieter hours overnight monitoring officers would be expected to complete the paperwork for busier periods, reducing the number of staff required at peak times.

CCTV may also be used in mobile units. These may be highly visible, to act as a deterrent, or in unmarked cars designed to act as a more general deterrent. These units will be evaluated for use in Southwark.

## **Persistent offenders**

Over the past three years the following number of people have received three or more PCNs:

2001/02	1,159
2002/03	585
2003/04	1,509

The improvement in 2002/03 was the result of a generally higher level of enforcement. The fall-back in 2003/04 was associated with a substantial number of PCNs resulting from CCTV surveillance, and would be expected to reduce along with the number of PCNs issued in these locations.

The handheld computers used by the Parking Attendants are now programmed with information on persistent offenders, which has made it possible for their vehicles to

be clamped in addition to issuing PCNs. Because of the other variables it is difficult to assess how effective this procedure has been.

The total number of offences carried out by persistent offenders is not a significant proportion of total PCNs, although special measures to deal with persistent offenders are critical for the overall credibility of the enforcement regime.

## Customer services

### *Strategic principle*

*A commitment to clear standards of enforcement, high quality of customer services, and a high level of public information on both services and policy (Objectives 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10)*

There is one dedicated Parking Shop on the Old Kent Road. This is operated by the enforcement contractor. As well as offering counter services for obtaining permits and collecting PCN charges it is the operational centre for the contractor. The contractor's IT systems are located within the shop. The telephone caller facility is also operated from the shop. The Best Value Review carried out in 2001 suggested that the premises were cramped and inconvenient for the operations involved.

Opening hours for both the shop and the telephone calling facility are currently 9.00 to 6.30 Monday to Saturday. PCNs can be paid by credit or debit card by phone. Permits can be obtained by post as well as through the shop.

The contractor is required to work to a number of key service standards including:

- 24 hour turnround of postal permit requests
- Call answering times?
- Waiting time at shop?
- 2 days to respond to informal representations (this may be critical since the discount period for paying PCNs ends after 14 days)
- 10 days to respond to formal representations
- 10 days to respond to general complaints

Targets are generally being maintained (?). There are currently few complaints about the administrative and customer facilities available. The principal focus of complaints has been the limitations of operating only one counter outlet, itself in a relatively inaccessible location (particularly for car drivers).

### THE ABOVE PARAS REQUIRES FURTHER RESEARCH

The Council provides parking information on its Web site. But this information has not been fully updated, and the sections which provide information on the process for challenging PCNs could be fuller. They do not provide the level of advice on the grounds for a successful challenge or the evidence which may be required which may be found in the ALG's leaflets and Web site. This information may be critical in assisting members of the public to decide whether they should pay at the discount rate or challenge a PCN, which could encourage a higher level of payment.

No information is published on service standards for responding to customer requests, challenges to PCNs or other complaints.

The site includes a facility for downloading permit application forms.

The only leaflet information currently available sets out the regulations relating to people with a disability.

No recent customer satisfaction surveys have been carried out.

A clearer set of customer service standards together with an enforcement charter will be introduced aimed at providing a high level of customer service and raising awareness of the reasons for parking control, and the alternatives to travel by car. These will include commitments to:

Readily accessible facilities for obtaining permits and paying penalties

Courteous enforcement based on sound procedures

Fair and efficient disputes handling

Good quality information on parking facilities and regulations

Clear statements of service levels to be expected (permit sales, information enquiries and disputes handling)

Maintaining a channel for public feedback on operational issues

Public information on the principles underlying regulations, enforcement performance and improvement programmes

Measures to raise awareness of the responsibilities of drivers and owners

Continuous monitoring of customer satisfaction, together with periodic in depth surveys

## **Implementation**

There will be six strands in the implementation of this plan:

### **Consultation on the plan itself**

Consultation on the plan will be undertaken alongside consultation on the transport LIP. This stage is expected to be concluded by June 2005, at which point the PEP will be reviewed prior to submission to the Council Executive for full approval.

### **Consultation on detailed policies which it is proposed to review**

If the Objectives and Strategic Principles set out in this plan are approved further focused consultations will be undertaken on:

- The proposed core control regimes
- Permit changes
- Parking for people with a disability

Limited routine action will, however, continue on these issues prior to the development of more detailed policies, including

- Periodic reviews of meter and permit charges consistent with current policies
- Routine introduction of disabled parking bays where a specific need is demonstrated

### **A rolling programme of CPZ reviews**

The council aims to undertake a review of all new zones 6 to 12 months after introduction (lack of resources has resulted in some slippage in this programme). Reviews have also been carried out on some older zones, where deficiencies have been evident. And a programme has been initiated to bring the regimes of all zones into line with the most recent zones – the key changes required is the extension of the use of residents parking bays to Blue Badge holders, the introduction of Shared Use Bays, and the introduction of discounts for alternative fuel vehicles and motorcycles.

Reviews have recently been undertaken, or are currently programmed for the oldest zones (B and D) and the Central Activity zones (C1, C2 and F). Other reviews have recently been undertaken in response to specific local issues (Zone L).

Implementation of the strategic principles and action points in this PEP will require review and modification of all zones. In some cases zones recently reviewed will require further modification.

It would be impractical to implement all the principles set out in this PEP in the short term. Meanwhile, high priority issues, such as review of the most recently introduced Zones, and modification of older zones with unsatisfactory arrangements (such as Zone B), should not be delayed.

It is therefore recommended that the councils adopts a review programme based on short term and longer term objectives as set out in Table ^ (at end of Section).

### **Continuous improvements at local 'hotspots'**

The council will continue to maintain a running list of local 'hotspots' and will set aside an appropriate level of funding and technical staff time to implement small scale improvements on a continuous basis.

### **The implementation of enforcement and customer services improvements**

These improvements will include:

- An enforcement charter
- A set of customer services standards
- Re-negotiation of the enforcement contract to include a wider range of performance measures and a clearer specification of the scope to which the client may set operational objectives
- New customer service facilities linked to the council's new customer service points
- Improved information

### **Further reviews and surveys on specific topics**

These will include

- documentation and subsequent consolidation of all Orders
- surveys of the case for new CPZs outside the areas currently covered
- the development of a set of design principles for signage and road-markings
- topic surveys on
  - demand by commuters for parking at public transport access points
  - demand fro parking in the vicinity of major community facilities such as hospitals and religious centres
  - the dependence of retail and other businesses in town centres on access by car
  - the distribution or motor cycle facilities

## Management

Parking functions are currently split between two departments within the council. Enforcement and physical implementation are currently the responsibility of two separate sections within the Environment and Leisure Department, while policy, design and public consultation are the responsibility of the Transport Planning Group within the Regeneration Department. Responsibility for the budget, including the level of funding available from internal sources lies with the Environment and Leisure Department, although the Regeneration Department has responsibility for the management of externally funded transport programmes, including programmes funded by TfL.

These arrangements are currently being re-organised. Responsibility for design and consultation on CPZs is being transferred to the Environment and Leisure Department. The Regeneration department will retain responsibility for overall policy, and will also continue to be engaged in promoting Traffic Orders to promote road safety and improve the flow of traffic.

Historically, funding for the review and consultation on CPZs and other parking controls has been provided through the establishment of two posts through the council's budget for transport planning, and limited ad hoc allocations of funds for specific proposals from the Parking Account. Implementation of new schemes in recent years has been funded largely through TfL programmes for measures to complement the Congestion Charge. In this context it has been difficult to maintain a progressive and consistent programme throughout the borough.

Under the new arrangements there will be improved integration of the detail of design and consultation with enforcement and physical implementation. This will provide an opportunity to establish a regular programme of review, consolidation and improvement of parking measures. But the success of these changes in the management arrangements will depend on:

- The allocation of sufficient funds from the parking account to build up a team with the capacity to maintain a consistent programme of review and consultation, and sufficient funds the implementation of improvements.
- Improved liaison between the programme managers in the Environment and Leisure Department and the policy team in the Regeneration Department
- Maintenance of effective operational liaison with the Regeneration Department on new Traffic Orders to ensure consistency and avoid duplication. This will need to include arrangements for liaison with the emergency services and public transport operators.

## Finance

### Income and costs

Table 16 summarises the income and expenditure on the parking account.

**Table 16     Parking Account summary**

	<b>2001/02</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>2003/04</b>
Off-street	189,728	223,877	237,590
PCNs, clamps and removals	4,849,587	5,303,875	6,729,824
Meters	1,086,799	977,354	1,040,011
Permits	643,637	754,246	812,294
PCN income from LBN CCTV scheme (2)	0	0	502,199
Other inc. internal	13,027	159,192	95,849
	<b>6,782,778</b>	<b>7,418,544</b>	<b>9,417,767</b>
Contractor	3,514,065	4,407,891	4,235,612
Repairs and maintenance	232,512	201,933	226,183
Running costs	904,487	648,916	942,984
Management and overheads (1)	195,144	241,693	971,417
	<b>1,936,570</b>	<b>1,918,111</b>	<b>3,041,571</b>
Application of surpluses			
Abandoned vehicles, school crossings, CCTV	202,755		447,268
Minor road improvements	717,623	722,550	991,657
Street lighting	1,016,192	1,195,561	1,361,569
Highways structures strengthening			212,561
Other Highways improvements			28,516
	<b>1,936,570</b>	<b>1,918,111</b>	<b>3,041,571</b>

Notes (1): Internal re-charges included for the first time in 2003/04

(2): The cost of operating costs and enforcement for the LBN CCTV scheme is estimated at around £250,000.

A number of points may be highlighted:

- PCN income represented 71% of total income. Meter income and permit income are much less, each at 10 % of the total. There has been no change in these proportions over the last three years.
- Around one third of the increase in permit income, amounting to around £50,000 was the result of new CPZs. These will also have contributed to increases in the cost of enforcement – the net income from any new CPZs is likely to be small.
- The increase in PCN income over the last two years was mainly attributable to an increase in the penalty rate (from £80 to £100 in most of the borough). This together with the additional income resulting from the CCTV traffic enforcement schemes account for most of the increase in income and surpluses.

It is estimated that overall it costs £0.75 to collect £1 of income, excluding income from PCNs issued as a result of CCTV surveillance. The bulk of the income to the account derives from the CCTV monitored schemes, roads outside CPZs ('A' Zone),

Peckham and the zones in the Central Activity Zone. CPZs elsewhere contribute little to the overall surplus. In contrast, CCTV surveillance appears to contribute a substantial operating surplus.

Legislation requires that the total fees and charges collected must exceed the operating costs. There are also restrictions on the way in which the Council can use these surpluses. They must in summary be used for other traffic management schemes, or for road safety improvements which improve road safety such as pedestrian safety measures, street-lighting, and removal of obstructions. The table above shows how Southwark has utilised the surpluses on the account. Although limited sums have been available for maintenance of existing parking infrastructure the council has not re-invested any surpluses in extending or updating its CPZs. The initial investment costs of new zones introduced in recent years have been met entirely for funds from TfL for new zones in areas potentially affected by the Congestion Charge.

### **Future funding requirements and sources of funds**

Management, monitoring and continuous maintenance of parking and enforcement arrangements requires funding and staffing for:

- Enforcement and customer services (externally contracted)
- Management of enforcement (including responding to representations and monitoring)
- Policy, programme development and review (including costs of surveys, outline designs, and consultation)
- Maintenance of infrastructure (including meter replacement, IT system maintenance, signage and road markings)
- New scheme or revised scheme implementation (including fees costs of detailed designs and legal costs of Orders)

Sources of funding include:

- The Parking Revenue Account: since this is likely to remain in surplus there is unlikely to be a case for funding parking operations, maintenance or the implementation of new schemes from the council's core budget or capital programme
- External public funding for new scheme implementation: in the past this has included TfL, but there is little likelihood of funding from this source in the immediate future
- Private developer contributions: these are likely to be limited to developer contributions associated with specific development schemes. But it may be possible to secure contributions from developers to wider area schemes if these are clearly specified in the forward programme.

The surplus on the parking revenue account has increased significantly over the last three years. There is the potential for further increases from:

- Year on year increases in the level of enforcement activity, including the extension of the range of offences covered and the introduction of further CCTV surveillance (both fixed and mobile)
- Improvements in the recovery rate for PCNs
- Increased meter charges in line with the proposed core regimes
- Increased permit income from additional households and higher levels of car ownership
- Modifications and extensions of CPZs
- Introduction of additional localised waiting restrictions

Implementation of the recommendations of this PEP would result in a number of increases in costs of over £500,000pa for high priority actions and a further £35,000 pa for low and medium priority actions including:

- £200,000pa to maintain a programme of investment in undertaking and implementing CPZ reviews
- £100,000pa for progressive extension of CCTV surveillance
- £80,000 for the introduction of discounts for low pollution vehicles and other changes in permit charges
- £80,000pa for improved customer services
- £40,000pa for regular customer satisfaction surveys
- £30,000 for topic reviews and surveys

It is estimated that the additional income which could be achieved should cover the additional operating costs of implementing the highest priority actions, but it would not cover the cost of one-off surveys, investment in new equipment or the implementation of major CPZ revisions.

## **Monitoring and equality assessment**

### **Performance indicators**

TfL have set out three performance indicators which they will use in monitoring the parking Targets in the London Transport strategy:

- Compliance: number of contraventions (moving and non-moving offences) based on quarterly surveys
- Business satisfaction with parking and loading restrictions, based on surveys
- Public provision of long stay parking at major town centres (reductions in actual number and proportion of total)

It is proposed that Southwark should develop local versions of the first two indicators, in the context of the proposed survey of businesses and the proposed review of the enforcement contract. It is not proposed to establish a local indicator to replicate TfL's third indicator because there is relatively little long stay parking directly under the control of the Council in Southwark (not including permit bays in CPZs).

Other local indicators will also be established covering

- Enforcement activities
- Customer services delivery
- General customer satisfaction
- Traffic flow obstructions by parked vehicles
- Adherence to development control guidelines on parking
- Levels of general public complaints about parking (not parking services)
- Speed of resolving 'hotspot' issues

### **Equalities impact assessments**

Equalities impact assessments will be carried out within the terms of the Council's policies for all new parking controls, major modifications or service developments. These assessments will include in particular:

- Monitoring of consultation processes
- Assessment of the impact of parking controls on local businesses
- Assessment of the impact of controls on people with a disability
- Assessment of the impact of new policies on poorer sections of society
- Assessment of the impact of controls on the social and cultural activities of all communities
- Review of the accessibility to all information on regulations and customer services

**Table 7 Illustrative CPZ regimes for consultation**

	Central Activity Zone	Commuter zones	Retail centres	High density development zones	Residential areas – access and safety issues
Operating hours (controls and meters)	7 days, 24 hrs	10 -12.00 Mon - Fri	8.30 – 6.30 Mon -Sat	8.30 – 6300 Mon - Sat	8.30 – 6.30 Mon - Fri
Meter charges	£4.00 per hour Max 2 hrs	£2.40 /hr Max 4 hrs	£2.40 /hr, max 2hrs £0.50 /hr max 1 hr close to shops	£2.40 /hr Max 2 hrs	£3.00 for day
Meter collection	Pay and display				
Bays	Segregated: business,	Shared use	Segregated	Segregated	Shared use
Car clubs and car share	Bays for registered schemes	As Central	n/a	As Central	As Central
Permit charges	£150 £80 low emission vehicles £50 alternative fuel and motorcycles	£80 £50 for alternative fuel vehicles and motorcycles	As Commuter zones	£150 £80 low emission vehicles £50 alternative fuel and motorcycles	£50
Business permits	Multi-zone business £500 (max 1 for 4 tradesmen or equivalent, total 50 per business) Single zone business £150	As Central	As Central	As Central	As Central
Visitors	Vouchers at £6 Per day	Vouchers at £3 per day	As Commuter zones	As Commuter zones	£2.00 per day
Loading bays	Review required				
Special permits	Standard across zones				
Disability parking	As current policy				

**Table 10 Current CPZ regime**

			Operation of		Operation of bays		Business bays	Free bays –all day	Free bays – short stay	Doctors' bays	Loading bays	Visitor permits available	Shared use bays	M/cycle discounts	Meter charges	Max stay
			restrictions	of												
C1	2001	Bankside	8.00/6.30	M/F	8.00/6.30	M/Sun					Yes	Yes	No	No	£2.40	4
C2	2001	Bankside/ Borough	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F					Yes	Yes	No	No	£2.40	4
D	1970	Borough	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F						No	No	No	£2.00	4
F	1998	London Bridge	8.00/6.30	M/Sat	8.00/6.30	M/Sat						Yes		Yes	£2.00	4
GR	2003	Grange	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F						Yes	Yes	Yes	£2.00	4
G	1998	Bermondsey	8.00/6.30	M/F	8.00/6.30	M/F						Yes	No	Yes	£2.00	4
SB	2003	Bermondsey S	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F						Yes	Yes	Yes	£2.00	4
T	2004	Trafalgar	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F						Yes	Yes	Yes	£1.20	4
H	1998	Rotherhithe W	8.00/6.30	M/F	8.00/6.30	M/F						Yes	No	No	£2.00	4
N	2000	Rotherhithe S	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	£2.00	4
E	1997	Walworth W	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F			Yes			Yes	No	No	£2.00	4
J	1999	Walworth SW	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F			Yes			Yes	No	No	£2.00	4
M1	2001	Walworth NE	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F						Yes	Yes	Yes	£1.20	2
M2	2004	Walworth SE	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F						Yes	Yes	Yes	£2.00	4
K	1999	Camberwell	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F					Yes	Yes	No	No	£2.00	4
L	1999	Camberwell S	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F						Yes	No	No	£2.00	4
B	1974	Peckham TC	8.30/6.30	M/Sat	8.00/6.30	M/Sat		Yes			Yes	No	No	No	V 60p	4
HH	2004	Herne Hill	8.30/6.30	M/F	8.30/6.30	M/F						Yes	Yes	Yes	£1.20	4

**Notes:**

V: vouchers not meters (in meter charge column)

Meter hours and days are the same as basic hours of restrictions within each zone

There are no variations in permit charges by zones

The same provisions for essential workers' parking on yellow lines and in bays apply to all zones

**Table 12 CPZ Review programme**

		Originally introduced	Latest major revision	Original reason	PEP category	Operational issues	Long term issues	Scheduled review
C1	Bankside	1970	2001	City centre	Central Zone	Hours or operation	24 hour/ 7 day operation	2005
C2	Bankside/ Borough	1970	2001	City centre	Central Zone	Hours of operation	24 hour/ 7 day operation	2005
D	Borough	1970		City centre	Central Zone	General updating	24 hour/ 7 day operation	2006
F	London Bridge	1999	2003	Jubilee line	Central Zone		24 hour/ 7 day operation	
GR	Grange	2003		Congestion charge	Commuter/b usiness		Commuter areas regime	
G	Bermondsey	1999		Jubilee line	Commuter/b usiness		Commuter areas regime	
SB	Bermondsey S	2003		Congestion charge	Commuter/b usiness		Commuter areas regime	
T	Trafalgar	2004		Congestion charge	Commuter/ business	Experimental Order Pilot for commuter area regime		Current
H	Rotherhithe W	1999		Jubilee line	Commuter		Commuter areas regime	
N	Rotherhithe S	2000		Jubilee line	Commuter		Commuter areas regime	
E	Walworth W	1997		Sequential	Town centre/ residential		Split into town centre strip and residential area	2006
J	Walworth SW	1999		Sequential	Town centre/ residential		Split into town centre strip and residential area	2006
M1	Walworth NE	2001	2003	Sequential	Town centre/ residential		Split into town centre strip and residential area	
M2	Walworth SE	2004	2004	Congestion charge	Town centre/ residential	Experimental Order	Split into town centre strip and residential area	Summer 2005
K	Camberwell	1999		Sequential	Residential			2005
L	Camberwell S	1998		Sequential	Residential/ specific attractors/ Commuter			Current
B	Peckham TC	1974		Town centre	Town centre	General updating Parking to support local businesses		Current
HH	Herne Hill	2004		Congestion charge	Commuter	Experimental Order	Commuter areas regime	Spring 2005

Possible future survey areas								
	East Dulwich				Town centre/ residential/ specific attractor		Station Town centre High density residential	Survey completed
	North Camberwell				Town centre/ residential		Town Centre High density residential	
	Peckham West				Residential		High density residential	Previous survey
	Livesey				Residential/ business		Employment centre	Previous survey
	Nunhead				Residential/ specific attractor		Station High Density residential	Previous survey
	Queen's Road				Residential/ specific attractor		Station High density residential	Previous survey
	Lordship Lane				Town centre/ residential		Town centre High density residential	Previous survey
	Peckham Rye						High density development	

**General issues:**

- Only most recent zones have
  - Discounts for alternative use vehicles
  - Motorcycle discounts
  - Provision for Blue Badge holders to use residents' bays
  - Provision for car clubs
- CPZs introduced prior to 1999 do not have shared use bays

**Table 13 Permits currently available**

		1mth	3mth	6mth	12mth	Motor-cycle
Residents	Unlimited number per household Motor-cycle discounts only available in 7 zones May be used in Residents or Shared Use Bays (not meter bays)	£10	£25	£43	£80	£19
Alternative fuel vehicles	Available in ^ zones. Cost £^^ pa for vehicles which attract Powershift recognition					
Visitors	Available to residents in books of 10. Max 10 books per year. 1 <sup>st</sup> book each year £12, further books £30 Not available in zones B and D (Peckham and Borough) May be used in Permit or meter bays					
Business	Essential business vehicles –includes vehicles operated by business and suppliers' vehicles Market traders permits available in M1 and M2 zones Whole day parking not permitted May be used in permit bays (Business bays only where specific bays are provided) or Shared Use bays Limited number provided to selected schools (???)		£65	£130	£255	
Doctors and ambulances	Use in Doctors' bays only (near surgeries). Not for all day parking.				£72	
Home Care Workers	Issued to organisations – max 5 (22 currently approved organisations) May be used on yellow lines for 3hrs Not for use in Residents, Business, or Shared Use bays or in meter bays				£76	
Green badge	Health care professionals and Occupational therapists May be used on yellow lines (for 2 hrs), and in Shared Use and meter bays, and in council car parks Not for use in Residents, Business or Doctors' bays				£10 £100	
Estates - residents	For estates in which there are parking restrictions				nil	
Estates - contractors	Managed by Neighbourhood offices				£30	
Blue Badges	For yellow line parking - cannot be used in permit bays in all zones					
Council workers	Limited availability for workers entitled to essential car users' allowance – cost £^^ to employing department					
Dispensations	Available to contractors and others who can demonstrate a need for parking –may be used in any type of permit bay. Cost £12/day					

## 14 Permit modification issues

	Issues	Options
Residents permits	There is no limit on the number of permits per resident (see para <sup>^^^</sup> )	Limitation on the number of permits per household or resident Limit to reflect availability of offstreet parking Higher charge for multiple permits.
Motorcycles	See para <sup>^^</sup>	
Energy efficient vehicles	See para <sup>^^</sup>	
Business permits	Business permits are restricted to use in one zones only. Daily dispensations require to be purchased for use in other zones. These are costly for short stay visits. There is currently no restriction on the number of permits per business. There is no provision for business visitors.	Introduce a multi-zone permit (at a substantially higher cost), alongside single zone permits (possibly at a reduced cost) and single day dispensations. Multi-zone, short stay permits (for use by for example service engineers) Restriction on number of permits per business (number, cost, limitation to liveried vehicles) Business visitor vouchers
Blue badge holders	See para <sup>^^</sup>	
Medical and professional carers	Currently two schemes with different provisions	Single integrated scheme, standardised of provision for health workers (Green Badge holders)
Private carers	Currently require visitor's voucher or to park in a meter bay	Discounted or zero cost vouchers restricted to one street – also higher limit on number. Restricted to residents approved by Social Services and in receipt of a disability care allowance
Essential workers	Some schools are currently allowed to purchase up to 10 business permits. This provision is to assist in recruitment, and could be applied equally to other hard-to-fill public service posts.	The provision of these permits should be assessed on a case by case basis against agreed criteria, including scope for offstreet parking in the vicinity and the availability of on-street parking in relation to demand