

# Executive

## Integrated Vehicle Parking Strategy - Civil Parking Enforcement and Residents Parking

11 January 2010

### Report of Head of Urban and Rural Services

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

To note the current position and revised financial model for Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) and to authorise further work to develop workable proposals.

To note the outcomes of the consultation on Banbury Residents Parking Scheme and to approve further development of proposals, subject to CPE.

To note the current position on Bicester Residents Parking Scheme and the formal Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertising/consultation for the revised Scheme.

To note the update on Taxi Rank provision and the bid to the Council's capital programme.

To note the current position regarding provision for disabled parking.

This report is public
-----------------------

#### **Recommendations**

---

The Executive is recommended to:

- (1) Civil Parking Enforcement
  - a) Note the updated position on CPE and revised Financial Model
  - b) Approve further development of the Council's approach to CPE based on this Financial Model whilst seeking to reduce CDC's risks/costs through negotiation with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC).

- c) Receive a further report on the outcome of these discussions and any changes to the Financial Model, prior to a final decision on implementation being taken.
  - d) As part of 1 (c) above, authorise the appointment of consultants to assist in developing the approach to CPE and in testing and refining the Financial Model.
  - e) Authorise investigation with OCC of on-street pay and display parking
- (2) Banbury Residents Parking Scheme
- a) Authorise further work on Scheme development on the assumption that CPE will be implemented and receive a further report in conjunction with a CPE report prior to formal consultation on a Scheme through the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process.
  - b) Note the outcomes of the Banbury Residents Parking consultation.
  - c) Receive a petition from the residents of Merton Street and Causeway (Zone 5) against the introduction of a Residents Parking Scheme in these streets.
  - d) Confirm that consultation feedback and the petition received from residents in Zone 5 demonstrates that there is not sufficient support for a Scheme in the Zone and that no further scheme development will take place, and will not be reviewed for at least 2 years.
  - e) Confirm that in Zone 3 where support for a Scheme from the consultation feedback was less than 50%, that no further Scheme development will take place and will not be reviewed for at least 2 years.
  - f) Agree in principle to a scheme based on the consultation proposals for Zones 1, 2 and 4 and authorise further investigations in to scheme viability for these zones based on a nil net cost to the Council.
  - g) To defer implementation pending the outcome of CPE.
- (3) Note the current position on Bicester Residents Parking and the proposals for a revised scheme to be introduced on or as soon after 1 April 2010 as formal consultation on a revised TRO for the Scheme allows.

- (4) Note the position on taxi rank provision, cost and funding and the application for capital funds to progress implementation in Banbury in 2010/11.
- (5) Note the position on provision of parking for the disabled.

## **Executive Summary**

---

### **Introduction**

- 1.1 Work on CPE and Residents Parking Schemes has to date been progressed in tandem as any further residents parking proposals can only be implemented effectively following the introduction of CPE in Cherwell. This will transfer the powers to enforce on-street contraventions from the police to the Council via an agency agreement with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) so that both on-street and off-street parking are managed under the same policy. It is proposed to continue this approach.

### **CPE**

- 1.2 A financial model has been set up based on the Council accepting full cost/risk and sets out the costs and income that is projected from CPE based on consultant's forecasts and officer moderation of these forecasts. There are a number of sensitivities factored into the model which in turn are based on a series of assumptions, necessary at this modelling stage to arrive at a financial projection. Any variation in sensitivities and/or assumptions will significantly affect the model and consequently caution and clear understanding of the risks is required at this stage. The model at present is indicating an additional revenue cost estimated to be between £58,000 and £63,000 with up to £200,000 capital cost for set up purposes.
- 1.3 It is proposed that further negotiations be undertaken with OCC to try and secure a more equitable risk/cost share approach than currently set out in the model, with a view to implementation in 2011/12, and that on street pay and display parking be explored as part of the approach to implementing CPE in Cherwell. In addition, where the Council will still be reliant on OCC for key legal processes which only it as the highways authority can undertake, that assurances be sought that they be undertaken in a timely and supportive manner.

### **Banbury Residents Parking**

- 1.4 It is proposed that the petition received from residents of Merton Street and Causeway in Banbury is accepted as further consultation feedback. This would mean that response level of those in favour of the scheme falls beneath the 50% benchmark set by the Executive for a Scheme to be progressed in these streets.

- 1.5 Subject to progressing CPE, it is proposed that the Banbury Residents Parking consultation feedback report and the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, guide the detailed design and further investigations into the viability of establishing residents parking in Zones 1, 2 and 4 where consultation feedback indicates support above the 50% benchmark level.
- 1.6 That Zones 3 and 5 be excluded from any further scheme development having received less than the required 50% support through the consultation process.

### **Bicester Residents Parking Scheme**

- 1.7 A revised TRO has been prepared based on amendments to the Scheme that came out of the public consultation and officer review. This is now progressing through formal consultation prior to implementation on, or as soon after, 1 April 2010 when the Order is made.

### **Taxi Ranks**

- 1.8 It is proposed that negotiations with Stockdale continue so that appropriate taxi rank provision as part of the Bicester town centre development can be secured, rather than at Bell Lane which has not received support from local residents, church groups or Thames Valley Police (TVP).
- 1.9 It is proposed that the Bicester Market Square Project takes full account of the need for appropriate taxi rank provision
- 1.10 It should be noted that the capital bid for £11,000 for improvements to taxi ranks in Banbury is not recommended for funding in 2010/11 as it only scored 12 on the Capital Bid Scoring matrix.

### **Provision for Disabled Parking**

- 1.11 The Council provides free parking for blue badge holders in its car parks. Major projects in Banbury have had a significant impact on some of this provision, compounded by the development works affecting sections of highway traditionally used for parking by disabled drivers. Once works are completed improved parking for blue badge holders will be provided.

### **Conclusion**

- 1.12 Proposals for residents parking schemes and implementation on CPE need to be progressed in tandem to bring about the benefits of local

control of parking in Cherwell and to reduce the costs of implementing and running the schemes.

- 1.13 Considerable work has been undertaken on both projects but there remain a number of issues and risks, particularly that OCC would require the Council to bear all the costs and risks of implementation and operation of CPE. Detailed design, further investigation and continued negotiation may secure improved risk share profile and lower cost. If progress is to be made, the Council may have to accept a significantly higher cost to implement CPE than was first envisaged when OCC were indicating they would fund capital and start-up costs.
- 1.14 There is a pressing need for additional taxi rank space following the Council's decision to delimit Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licences. No funding is available from OCC, but negotiations with developers Stockdale are taking place to negotiate provision as part of the Bicester Town Centre project. A capital bid has been submitted to secure additional rank space in Banbury but this has not been recommended for funding in 2010/11. Kidlington is a lower priority and now needs to be considered as part of the Kidlington Pedestrianisation Project.
- 1.15 On completion of major projects in Banbury, improved parking for blue badge holders will be available.

## **Background Information**

---

### **Civil Parking Enforcement**

- 2.1 CPE transfers enforcement powers for on-street parking offences from the police to the local Highway Authority and then through an Agency Agreement with OCC to the Council. An Expression of Interest was submitted in 2009 to the Department for Transport (DfT) by OCC on behalf of the Council.
- 2.2 The Executive received reports on CPE at its October 2008 and March 2009 meetings setting out the background on CPE and an outline timetable that suggested implementation in April 2010. Following a change of position by OCC and their stepping back from providing financial support to implementing CPE in Cherwell, this timetable cannot now be achieved. It will be at least 15 months from agreement with OCC before CPE could 'go-live'.
- 2.3 CPE would have a number of benefits, most significantly in relation to this report is that it would provide the powers to Council staff to effectively enforce residents parking schemes; a fact that has been missing from the Bicester scheme and has given rise to issues and residents concerns about that scheme. CPE would also enable enforcement of parking contraventions in on-street areas and would

assist in managing pedestrianised areas as well as urban centres generally.

- 2.4 No further residents' parking schemes should be implemented prior to CPE being in place and operating effectively as schemes cannot be adequately enforced. The revised Bicester Scheme TRO has been designed with CPE in mind.
- 2.5 In view of the position with OCC, where they have withdrawn their earlier offer of funding the set up costs and have stated they will not take any risk associated with the operation of CPE, any timetable for implementation is dependent on the Council accepting full risk/ cost and progressing implementation with minimal support from OCC. This is likely to put back any likelihood of a scheme being finalised until 2011/12 and will require considerable input from the consultants that have been working with districts and the county council in Oxfordshire over the last few years.

### **Financial Model**

- 2.6 At its March 2009 meeting, the Executive approved negotiations with OCC on the basis of CPE being implemented in Cherwell at no or lowest cost to the Council. The original RTA Consultant's model identified set up costs for Cherwell in the order of £100K and annual deficit costs of £104k. This was based on county wide roll out of CPE and some shared services around Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) processing.
- 2.7 A revised financial model has been produced by RTA Consultants based on full cost/risk being carried by the Council. Updated assumptions in line with current experience from off street parking and Excess Charge Notice (ECN) recovery, and some assumptions about on street pay and display have been modelled. This model has been modified to integrate Council costs rather than the costs RTA use in the model to try and reflect the likely actual cost position. This work still comes with significant caveats as explained below. The model at present is indicating an additional revenue cost estimated to be between £58,000 and £63,000 with up to £200,000 capital cost for set up purposes.
- 2.8 The model is based on a number of sensitivities and assumptions, any variation of which will have an effect on the annual income and running costs, and consequently there remains significant risk with the figures currently presented. These sensitivities/assumptions include:
  - Number of enforcement staff
  - Number of penalty charge notices (PCNs) issued per member of staff
  - Payment rates- on-street and off street

- Discount rates
  - Tribunal hearings
  - Marginal effects on off-street income and ECN levels.
- 2.9 Costs could be reduced by looking closely at staffing and how warden services are provided across Cherwell. Greater use of technology to improve the efficiency of on-street working could also help to reduce operating costs. A capital bid was submitted for funding of new technology but this is not recommended for funding in 2010/11 as it only scored 17 on the Capital Bid Scoring Matrix. The basis of the bid being improved integration of information to warden's handhelds through Automated Number Plate Recognition on off-street car parks releasing staff to carry out on street enforcement. Shared back office services may also reduce costs. If the Council outsourced to a third party this would require the current Off-Street parking functions also being outsourced with possible redundancy implications, but there would still need to be an in house appeals resource. An alternative would be to seek others authorities to buy into a Cherwell CPE back office service with possible income/reduced cost accruing.
- 2.10 At this stage no agreement has been reached with OCC. The County's position was set out by Councillor Ian Hudspeth in July 2009: **“OCC is generally supportive of developing Civil Parking Enforcement schemes throughout the County, it is not however currently one of its highest transport priorities and as such the County are unable to divert its limited budgets from other priorities to support such initiatives. Should Cherwell DC therefore wish to proceed with CPE OCC would require that the District Council bear all costs and risks associated with the scheme.”**
- 2.11 In October 2009, further clarification was secured from OCC as follows:
- If CDC is prepared to accept all the financial risk of operating a CPE operation there is no reason why OCC should not apply for CPE powers and delegate the operation under an agency agreement. West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC) are going ahead on this basis.
  - OCC have completed the consolidation of the TROs in South Oxfordshire District Council and WODC, CDC is the next district to be consolidated and OCC has confirmed this work will be continuing. The costs CDC would bear are any legal costs which we would incur. This is unlikely to exceed £10k.
  - OCC parking policy will apply equally to each District's CPE. A draft Policy has been produced and was approved by OCC Cabinet in November 2009.

- OCC would be responsible for getting the signing and lining up to scratch. When we know that CPE is, if not imminent, then at least on a set timescale, then the exercise that has been carried out in WODC will be carried out for Cherwell and OCC will then be able to give an estimate. It is likely to be less than £80k.
- In general all income (on and off-street) will accrue to CDC unless and until the on street account goes into surplus. The surplus would be passed to the County's Section 55 account. OCC have an informal agreement with WODC enabling their use of any surplus.
- There can only be one Section 55 account for the county. Cherwell will have to maintain an on-street parking account, the surplus on which accrues to the county's Section 55 account. OCC are looking at a way of ring-fencing the surplus for use in the relevant district but all OCC have at the moment from DfT is a letter of comfort stating that, where possible, any surplus will be used in the district generating it.
- On Street Pay and Display is a bit different. It would be OCC that would have to do the work to get a scheme in place and then procure and install the machines. OCC would require to be reimbursed for any expense on design and implementation. How much of the income is retained by the DC and how much accrues to OCC is a matter for negotiation. Or CDC could reimburse OCC for the design and implementation costs and keep all the revenue.
- OCC would be quite happy for CDC to use consultants to do the work. We would however wish to agree which consultants. For CPE both CDC and OCC are using RTA Associates and, for continuity perhaps we should continue with them if there is a set schedule for the introduction of CPE. If CDC is appointing them it will need to fit CDC's procurement process.

### **On-Street Pay and Display Parking**

- 2.12 One possible option to explore to reduce capital and revenue costs is to introduce on street pay and display through cashless parking systems only. The Council currently uses RingGo in off-street car parks. Investigations could be made as to how this sort of service might be rolled out to on-street thereby avoiding capital costs of ticket machine purchase and installation and the on going revenue implications of maintenance, cash collections and ticket stationary. The RTA model has included some on street paid for parking but this needs far more rigorous assessment and can only be achieved with OCC agreement.
- 2.13 One significant factor here is that, under the operating requirements for CPE set by DfT, the revenue effects of off-street parking and on-street parking need to be kept accounted for quite separately. The Council's



interests in off street parking are safeguarded as a consequence of this, although there are knock on consequences to potential income in that the Penalty Charge Notice regime that comes in with CPE has to apply to both on-street and off-street and so the Council would lose some of the absolute control it currently has. This is most significant in terms of the penalty charge levels and the discounting regime and will have an adverse effect on current ECN income as 50% discounts for early payment apply to all penalty charges under CPE. With ECN's the Council only discount overstay from £50 to £40 if payment is received within 14 days. All other charge levels are payment at full rate unless successfully appealed. In addition, the requirement for separate accounts means that the Council can not directly benefit from any surplus in the on-street account.

### **Banbury Residents Parking Scheme**

- 2.14 The Executive received reports on Banbury Residents Parking at its October 2008 and March 2009 meetings. At its March 2009 meeting it agreed:
- The scheme principles.
  - The consultation process
  - The outline timescales –Target date May 2010 following the implementation of CPE.
  - The evaluation criteria- Schemes to progress if 50% of respondents voted in favour of a scheme in specific zones.
  - That areas consulted that do not want residents parking to be introduced are not re-consulted within a two year period.
- 2.15 **Consultation Process** - A full residents and business' consultation took place in 2009 with consultation packs sent to individual households and businesses in the proposed zones. Two public consultation events were held at the end of April 2009.
- 2.16 **Consultation Findings** - RTA Consultants reviewed the consultation responses and produced a report setting out their findings together with recommendations on which zones/streets a residents parking scheme might be reasonably considered. This is based on the agreed evaluation criteria of 50% of responses supporting scheme introduction.
- 2.17 A full copy of the Draft RTA report is available in the Members room and a summary of findings is set out in the various appendices that form this report. A summary has also been placed on the Council's website.
- 2.18 A petition signed by 75 residents of Merton Street/Causeway against the introduction of a Residents Parking scheme in Zone 5 was received 6 weeks after the deadline for return of consultation questionnaires and

after the Consultation Report was produced, consequently this is not included in the summary analysis below.

- 2.19 **Consultation Summary** - In brief, the consultation process secured response rates ranging from 21% in Zone 1 to 40% in Zone 2. This fairly low level of response was predicted by the consultants and led to the selection of the evaluation criteria that was clearly set out in the guidance leaflet enclosed with the consultation pack *“the Council will judge 50% of responses supporting a Scheme to be a reasonable basis on which to consider introducing a Scheme”*.
- 2.20 In practice what this means is the consultation process secured support for the introduction of a scheme in four of the five Zones but that this support represents as low as 10% of the properties in certain Zones. Properties with off street parking were included in the consultation but would not be eligible for a permit under the proposed scheme arrangements. Factors such as this will have influenced individual responses and could, in this specific case, have led to a vote against the scheme (as the resident with off street parking might have wanted to be able to have a permit but the scheme conditions would not enable this) or no vote cast at all (as they might have thought that as they have off-street parking it wasn't relevant to them).
- 2.21 Zones supporting introduction of residents parking based on this 50% criteria are: Zone 1 (51%); Zone 2 (68%); Zone 4 (71%); and Zone 5 (55%) (Zone 5 results are prior to the receipt of petition). A summary of the streets within each Zone is set out at Appendix 1.

In Zone 3, only 32% of responses were in favour of a scheme. In view of this being significantly lower than the 50% benchmark level it is proposed that no further work is undertaken to design residents parking for this area and to close the file for a minimum of two years to any further work.

- 2.22 Assessment of response on a Zone basis does mask some important variations in support for residents parking across specific roads within some Zones.
- 2.23 The road by road breakdown is set out in Appendix 2. In summary:
- Zone 1: A number of streets in this Zone fell beneath the 50% level. This zone could be reconfigured to exclude these specific streets and still provide a workable scheme. These excluded streets would suffer from displacement of commuter cars excluded from other streets within that Zone and this has been highlighted to residents in the consultation information, as has the position that the Council would not review streets consulted for a minimum of two years.
  - Zone 2: There is a logical exclusion of Bloxham Road, where support was less than 50%, without compromising the viability of a

scheme for the rest of the Zone. Similar displacement may be suffered as in Zone 1 above.

- Zone 4 is made up of three small areas brought together for the ease of administration. In Castle Street there is custom and practice of parking on the footway to increase available parking. This would need further assessment.

2.24 The consultation response from Zone 5 is significantly altered if the petition is taken into account. Whilst it is not possible to cross reference the petition with the consultation responses (as the process was anonymous), it is highly likely that the support now falls below the 50% benchmark and it is proposed that this now be accepted that residents in Zone 5 do not support a scheme and that no further work be done in this area.

2.25 **Response Level** - Whilst the level of response from resident and businesses is disappointing, and this was a specific concern raised at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting in June 2009, the consultation **has** enabled all residents and businesses in the proposed permit zones to have a say in whether they support a permit parking scheme or not. That a significant proportion of residents have not responded should not be a reason for amending the clear basis for decision making that has been agreed as part of the process of establishing scheme details i.e. 50% of respondents supporting a scheme.

2.26 **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** - Some of the other key issues that have emerged from the consultation and which were also raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are set out in the paragraphs below. A summary of the issues raised at the consultation events is at Appendix 3 and a summary of comments submitted with the consultation questionnaires is at Appendix 4.

2.27 **Permit Costs**- The consultation information set out that residents' permits would cost up to £100 and £125 for businesses.

If any schemes are introduced they must break even. It is not possible ahead of detailed design to be clear on precise costs as it depends on the number of zones, and the number and length of streets within zones, and the work required to install the required signage and lining.

2.28 It was considered important to advise people in the consultation the maximum likely permit costs so that they could decide whether this offered value for money. This remains the Council's position but further detailed design is required before more accurate costings can be put together. This could also include investigation of alternative solutions in seeking to reduce costs and therefore the permit fees charged. If any schemes are progressed at a lower permit cost it is likely that this

would increase support for schemes and the consultation response at £100 permit costs is likely to represent the worst case position in terms of support for a Scheme.

**2.29 Numbers of Permits** - The consultation information set out that only one permit would be available to each eligible property. This restriction is based on the assessed level of parking demand from residents and the space that is available for parking. Residents Parking Schemes can not physically increase space available on the highway; it merely establishes a management system that seeks to exclude vehicles that are not eligible under the scheme conditions, making it easier for residents to park closer to their properties. For Banbury the desired outcome is to exclude non-residents vehicles.

**2.30 Zone Capacities** - When considering permit parking schemes it is important to consider the parking capacity of the proposed zones and the number of vehicles owned by residents living in the zone. The on-street capacity of the zones has been assessed, although in some cases a small increase in the capacity may be achievable when the detailed TRO's are designed. As part of this process any existing waiting restrictions would be reviewed and some may no longer be required due to a change in circumstances since they were originally introduced.

It is usual practice to limit the number of permits available in a zone to a maximum of 125% of the available capacity i.e. 25% more permits issued than spaces available.

Schemes are likely to prove unpopular if permits are not available for second cars if there is clearly adequate space available on street. Conversely if significantly more permits are issued than the available parking capacity residents will feel that they have paid for a service which is not in reality available to them. Consequently it was decided that permits would be limited to one per eligible property.

The ratio of properties to spaces range from 0.55 in Zone 1 to 1.42 in one section of Zone 4. Zone capacities are set out at Appendix 5.

In some areas the number of cars owned by residents is itself the pressure that is creating the problem rather than commuter parking. For example in Zone 1, an assessment from the consultation questionnaires of car ownership identifies that:

- 51% have one vehicle
- 23% have two vehicles
- 5% have three vehicles
- 2% have four vehicles.

**2.31 Eligible Properties** - The consultation set out that an Eligible Property is one registered separately for council tax and having no off-street

parking facilities. This may have prompted residents that do have off street parking to vote against the scheme, or to decline to submit any response judging it not to be relevant to them as they already have parking facilities. If on-street parking space is to be maximised for the benefit of residents then excluding from the scheme properties that are able to park off-street was considered a reasonable approach, this remains the current position. These properties would however be eligible for visitor passes.

**Business Responses** - A total of 28 businesses responded to the consultation. 23 of these were from Zone 1. 74% of these did not support the scheme. 57% of the businesses in Zone 1 have off street parking.

Of the 5 other business responses all were supportive of a scheme.

2.32 A review by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 9 June 2009 raised concerns that have been summarised in this report. That meeting suggested consideration of alternatives to a £100 permit scheme. These included:

- The Council purchasing space at underutilised privately operated car parks (NCP; Railway station; Meteor).
- Reducing commuter parking by arranging a shuttle bus service.
- On street pay and display to subsidise the costs of residents parking
- Increasing car parking capacity in the town centre by building a decked car parking over existing car park

On-street pay and display would be appropriate to investigate further and proposals for the Cultural Quarter include additional car parking.

2.33 **Summary of RTA Consultants recommendations-** The specific recommendations for each zone are summarised below:

- Zone 1 - Introduce a scheme in a reduced area, operative 7 days a week between 8.00am and 8.00pm
- Zone 2 - Introduce a scheme in a reduced area, operative 7 days a week between 8.00am and 8.00pm
- Zone 3 - Scheme should not proceed
- Zone 4
  - (i) Warwick Road: Introduce a scheme in a reduced area, operative 7 days a week between 8.00am and 8.00pm
  - (ii) Castle Street: Defer pending further consultation.
- Zone 5 - Introduce scheme operative Monday-Friday between 8.00am and 6.00pm. This should now be reconsidered in light of the petition and is recommended not to proceed.

### **Bicester Residents Parking Scheme**

- 2.34 The Executive received an update on the Bicester Residents Parking Scheme at its March 2009 meeting and approved the interim and long-term proposals, delegating final scheme details to the Head of Urban and Rural Services in consultation with the Executive Member for Community Safety, Street Scene and Rural.
- 2.35 A revised Traffic Regulation Order based on proposed amendments to the scheme following the 2008 consultation has now been prepared and is progressing through final advertisement/consultation.
- 2.36 The current scheme is in place until 31 March 2010 with proposals for a revised scheme to be implemented from 1 April 2010. It is proposed that permits will cost £84 discounted next year to £42 plus an administration charge of £16. Visitor permits are also proposed to be chargeable at £12.50 for a book of 25 and maximum of 100 permits allocated to each household.
- 2.37 In the absence of CPE powers, the shortcomings in enforcement remain an issue, but significant progress has been made through a targeted approach in partnership with TVP. An improved warning notice process has also been put in place for use by the Vehicle Parks and Town Centre Wardens. This has run in tandem with targeted TVP presence and a more robust approach to prosecutions.
- 2.38 No additional streets are proposed in the new TRO.

### **Taxi Ranks**

- 2.39 The Executive received at its 6 July 2009 meeting a report with costed proposals for new/additional rank spaces in Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington.
- 2.40 Negotiations have taken place with OCC in connection with funding but they are unable to offer funds.
- 2.41 The Bell lane, Bicester proposal has come in for criticism from local residents and the church on Bell Lane. Consultation with TVP has also identified concerns. Further work on this proposal has therefore been put on hold, pending negotiations with Stockdale to provide suitable rank facilities as part of the town centre redevelopment.
- 2.42 The Market Square proposals are also out for consultation and the options have significant implications for existing ranks at Market Hill. Rank provision needs to be fully addressed within this project.
- 2.43 A bid for £11,000 has been made to the 2010/11 capital programme for improving/providing additional rank spaces in Banbury at Horsefair and North Bar. However this only scored 12 in the Capital Project Scoring matrix and it is not known yet whether this project will be supported.

## Provision for Disabled Parking

- 2.44 There has been significant disruption to parking in Banbury as a consequence of the Parson Street pedestrianisation scheme and the construction of the new Spiceball Leisure Centre. A number of spaces for blue badge holders have been affected by this work.

On completion of the Parson Street project, the number of dedicated parking places for blue badge holders that are provided in Market Place and North Bar will increase. There had been three formal blue badge spaces in Market Place but none of which were in the Council car park. In the Market Place blue badge holders could park on the double yellows for three hours, or in our car park for one hour but none were specifically marked out. There were also two formal spaces in the Council's North Bar car park.

On completion there will be the following formal blue badge parking spaces:

- Seven in Market Place car park - limited to 1 hour. Blue badge holders can also park in the other spaces free of charge.
- Five formal on street spaces by National Westminster Bank- limited to 1 hour. No other on street parking will be permitted
- Seven in North Bar car park (some of which could be considered for evening taxi rank use)

Blue badge holders will also be able to park in the pedestrianised area before 10:00am and after 4:30pm.

The new Spiceball Leisure Centre car park has 9 dedicated spaces for blue badge parking and/or parent and child parking.

Significant changes to car parking in Bicester will occur with the Market Square development and with the Town Centre works. Updates on these will be brought to future meetings.

## Key Issues for Consideration/Reasons for Decision and Options

- 3.1 **CPE:** Implementation of CPE is key to successful management of parking, particularly in urban centres. It is fundamental to the effective enforcement of on-street traffic contraventions and in successfully managing residents parking schemes. The costs, income and risk share profile are key issues and will be the subject of further analysis and reports.
- 3.2 **Banbury Residents Parking:** A number of residential streets immediately adjacent to the town centre suffer from acute parking difficulties and create real problems for residents. The Council has approved considering implementing residents parking where the

response from the consultation process is at 50% support. Costs of the scheme; the number of permits available to residents; the definition of eligible properties; whether consultation in alternate language was required; parking capacity and car ownership are all significant issues around which any decision to proceed must be based.

- 3.3 **Bicester Residents Parking:** The amended TRO is fundamental to implementing a revised scheme and plans are in place for formal consultation.
- 3.4 **Taxi Ranks:** Legal process and DfT approval as well as securing funding are key issues to be addressed.
- 3.5 **Provision for Disabled Parking:** Bicester Market Square and Town Centre projects need to take full account of parking requirements.

The following options have been identified. The approach in the recommendations is believed to be the best way forward. The highlighted option is the current position.

<b>CPE Options</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Not to continue progress on CPE.</li><li>2. To pursue on a co-ordinated County wide basis</li><li><b>3. To pursue independently of the other Oxfordshire districts.</b></li></ol>
<b>Banbury Residents Parking Options</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Not to progress with any schemes in Banbury</li><li>2. To progress with a scheme in all proposed zones</li><li><b>3. To consider the consultation feedback and make modifications to zones based on the feedback received, and undertake further detailed design and investigation to look at costs reduction options.</b></li></ol>
<b>Bicester Residents Parking Options</b>	<b>No alternative options arising from this report.</b>
<b>Taxi Ranks Options</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Not to progress with any of the ranks reported to the July Executive</li><li>2. Progress all of the ranks</li><li><b>3. Progress on a phased basis having identified priorities and funding</b></li></ol>
<b>Disabled Parking Options</b>	<b>No alternative options arising from this report.</b>

## **Consultations**

---

<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b>	OCC have been a partner in developing initial proposals but are not able to progress on the basis of the costs and risks that have to date been identified as their responsibility.
-----------------------------------	---



<b>Residents and businesses in Banbury</b>	See RTA's consultation report summary.
<b>Banbury Town Council</b>	None arising
<b>Bicester Town Council</b>	None arising.
<b>Residents of Bicester</b>	See Council website

## **Implications**

---

**Financial:** There are significant financial implications in relation to implementing both CPE and Residents Parking. At this stage of the design, outline detail has been prepared on costs and income. This needs further consideration and to be subject to further reports to the Executive before final decision.

Comments checked by Karen Muir, Service Accountant, 01295 221545.

**Legal:** CPE involves transfer of powers from the police to the Highway Authority, and then through an Agency Agreement to CDC. These powers will then enable the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers to issue Penalty Charge Notices for parking contraventions. The requirements would be set out in Policy documents prepared and agreed with OCC.

Residents Parking will require revised TRO's to be agreed with OCC.

Comments checked by Liz Howlett, Head of Legal and Democratic Services. 01295 221686

**Risk Management:** There are financial, legal and reputational risks attached with both CPE and residents parking. These need to be fully considered and mitigated so far as is reasonably practicable through agreed procedure and policy with OCC.

Comments checked by Rosemary Watts, Risk Management and Insurance Officer 01295 221566

## **Wards Affected**

---

All

## Corporate Plan Themes

---

### An Accessible Value for Money Council

### Executive Portfolio

---

**Councillor Nigel Morris**

**Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, Street Scene and Rural**

### Document Information

---

<b>Appendix No</b>	<b>Title</b>
Appendix 1	List of Zones and streets.
Appendix 2	Percentage response on street by street basis
Appendix 3	A summary of the issues raised at the consultation events
Appendix 4	A summary of comments submitted with the consultation questionnaires
Appendix 5	Zone capacities.
<b>Background Papers</b>	
1. Executive reports October 2008 and March 2009	
2. Overview and Scrutiny Committee report 2009	
3. Banbury Residents Parking-website information	
4. Bicester Residents Parking-website information	
<b>Report Author</b>	Chris Rothwell, Head of Urban and Rural Services
<b>Contact Information</b>	01295 221712 chris.rothwell@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

## BANBURY RESIDENTS PARKING - CONSULTATION ZONES

PROPOSED ZONE NUMBER	ORIGINAL ZONE(S)	STREETS INCLUDED
BY1	1	Albert Street
		Amos Court
		Ashby Court
		Britannia Road
		Broad Street
		Calthorpe Road
		Dashwood Road
		Fairview Road
		Gatteridge Street
		Grosvenor Road
		Grove Street
		Lucky Lane
		Marlborough Place
		Marlborough Road
		Newland Place
		Newland Road
Old Parr Close		
Old Parr Road		
Prospect Road		
St. John's Road		
BY2	2	Beargarden Road
		Bloxham Road (Beargarden Road to Harriers View)
		Crouch Street
		Monument Street
		New Road
BY3	3	Bath Road
		Broughton Road
		Kings Road
		Park Road
		Queens Road

BY4	5	Castle Street (north side)
	6	Warwick Road (part) (North side only - nos 132-190)
	4	Warwick Road (part) (South side only - nos 17-35)
BY5	7	Causeway (south side)
		Junction Road
		Merton Street (north side)

issue one  
05 02 09

## Appendix 2

### Banbury Questionnaire Responses - Residential

#### Q10 Do you support the introduction of a residents parking scheme in your area

ZONE 1	YES		NO		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Albert Street	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%
Amos Court	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%
Britannia Road	20	38%	28	54%	4	8%
Broad Street	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
Calthorpe Road	7	41%	9	53%	1	6%
Dashwood Road	8	53%	7	47%	0	0%
Fairview Road	3	25%	9	75%	0	0%
Gatteridge Street	16	84%	3	16%	0	0%
Grosvenor Road	4	44%	5	56%	0	0%
Grove Street	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%
Marlborough Place	6	60%	4	40%	0	0%
Marlborough Road	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%
Newland Place	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%
Newland Road inc Ashby Court	9	60%	5	33%	1	7%
Old Parr Close	5	33%	9	60%	1	7%
Old Parr Road	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%
Oxford Road	2	25%	5	63%	1	13%
Paxmans Place	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Prospect Road	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%
St Johns Road	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4%</b>

ZONE 2	YES		NO		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Bear Garden Road	9	56%	7	44%	0	0%
Bloxham Road	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%
Crouch Street	14	67%	6	29%	1	5%
Milton Street	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%
New Road	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>

ZONE 3	YES		NO		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Bath Road	17	36%	30	64%	0	0%
Broughton Road	9	35%	17	65%	0	0%
Kings Road	6	21%	20	71%	1	4%
Park Road	7	41%	9	53%	1	6%
Queens Road	13	30%	29	67%	2	5%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>

ZONE 4	YES		NO		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Warwick Rd Nos. 17-29	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Castle Street	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Warwick Rd Nos. 132-188	9	53%	8	47%	0	0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

ZONE 5	YES		NO		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Causeway	9	53%	8	47%	0	0%
Junction Road	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Merton Street	8	62%	4	31%	1	8%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>

### Banbury Questionnaire Responses - Business

ZONE	YES		NO		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Zone 1	5	22%	17	74%	1	4%
Zone 2	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Zone 3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Zone 4	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Zone 5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>

## Feedback from Consultation Events 29/30 April 2009

## Schedule of comments raised by residents.

Updated 12 June 2009

Ref	Issue	CDC comment	Decision/Action
1	Costs: It's another Council taxation. Why does it cost so much? Why should I have to pay? £100 is too much.	<p>The scheme needs to cover the costs of it being developed and implemented. Costs include those related to processing permits, but also the design costs in terms of lining and signage as well as legal costs to put in place the Traffic Regulation Orders.</p> <p>It was felt important to identify a cost in the consultation in order for residents to judge whether the felt it was value for money. £100 is at the higher end of permit schemes we are aware of and we do not see the costs being above this. If anything they will be lower.</p>	A decision will be made on costs once the Council has a definitive design and have agreed on the streets and Zones that will be included. It will not be more than £100 and is anticipated to be less.
2	Rarely a problem for residents parking in Kings Rd/Queens Rd.	<p>If residents do not have any current issues then they are likely to opt not to have a scheme. However, displacement from adjacent streets is likely to occur and this is why streets where there may not be current problems have been included.</p> <p>In these specific roads there could also be further pressure from student parking on completion of the college extension.</p>	<p>A decision on whether these roads will be included in a residents parking scheme will be taken on conclusion of the consultation review. This will be reported to 6 July Executive.</p> <p>The Council do not envisage repeating consultation on Residents Permit schemes within a 2 year time frame.</p>
3	Excessive speeding on Beargarden Road.	Need to consider further with OCC	These matters have been raised with Oxfordshire County Council.

	<p>Ensure the Beargarden Road weight limit is enforced.</p> <p>Consider one way systems for Crouch Street and Beargarden Road – mixed views on this – some very much in favour and some dead set against.</p> <p>Reversal of parking in Beargarden Road – again some for and some against.</p>		
4	<p>Multi occupancy houses with a number of residents having cars. One permit will cause problems.</p>	<p>The proposal is for one permit as this provides an equitable way of ensuring each property has access to the scheme. The basis of this follows the traffic survey counts that have taken place. The Council could consider additional permits in circumstances where there is excess capacity on streets and it may be that a priority of access to additional permits forms part of the final proposals.</p>	<p>Should residents parking zones be introduced the scheme will be based on one permit per eligible household. This can be reviewed after a period of operation.</p>
5	<p>Display of motorbike permit-how will I be able to?</p>	<p>Permits will not be required to be displayed on motorbikes.</p>	<p>A database of permits issued to residents with motorbikes will be maintained and parking monitored using this information.</p>
6	<p>Narrow roads. How will we assess whether permit only parking will be allowed?</p>	<p>If residents vote for permit only parking, detailed scheme design will take place to ensure that roads can safely accommodate parking bays. This detailed design will also include signage and lines, including yellow lines, so that parking can also be excluded where required.</p>	<p>To be considered as part of detailed design.</p>
7	<p>What about the college student parking in the future</p>	<p>There is planning application for college extension.</p>	<p>Only eligible residents will be able to apply for a residents parking permit.</p>



8	What is the approach to community transport, age concern vehicles and the like when they have to park and collect elderly/disabled clients	Introduction of permit parking should ease parking/pick up/drop off for these vehicles as space will be released by the exclusion of non residents vehicles.	These vehicles will be permitted to undertake drop off and pick ups.
9	<p>Impact on businesses during this economic climate-could put small businesses that rely on customer parking on-street out of business.</p> <p>Concerns about hotels and guest houses blocking up residents parking.</p>	<p>Scheme proposals are to assist people who live in these streets to have available parking close to their properties. Some specific permit arrangements could be considered for such premises, but this would need to be carefully considered to ensure that residents do not continue to be faced with the same problems consequence of non resident vehicles.</p> <p>Residential areas close to hotels/guest houses are not designed as business car parks. Alternative off street parking is available for this. Note that after 6pm Mon-Sat and 4pm Sun Council off street car parks are free.</p> <p>Variations on the visitor permits or some form of season ticket for council car parks could be considered.</p>	To be considered further should permit parking zones be considered for these areas.
10	Why are the Council considering permit parking? How many complaints have the Council received.	<p>Over recent years a number of requests/complaints have been received from residents, and representations made to Ward Councillors that has led to the Council undertaking research into parking matters in residential areas.</p> <p>The aim of these proposals is to reduce the problems experienced by residents where there is commuter/shopper/shop and business staff parking in residential streets that makes it difficult for residents to park close to their properties.</p>	Decision on whether to progress will be taken based on whether residents support a scheme.
11	Is a courtyard classed as off street parking..it has gated		If there is dropped curb and provision for parking it would be

	access		classed as off street parking.
12	Grove Street-Britannia Childrens' centre-triangular area of grass-is it highways or could it be turned into private parking	Pick up with OCC	
13	Zone BY2 – Problems have been generated because of the doctors' surgery. Rearrange the parking at the surgeries and re-introduce overnight parking for local residents.	The doctors' surgery parking is private land and can not be controlled by the Council.  Planning approval was granted as there is sufficient parking within the premises and proximity to town centre parking.  The Council can facilitate dialogue with the surgery owners but is in no position to place any requirements on them to make available their private car park.	
14	An owner of several properties that operate as guest houses has sent one response in...should this actually be a response for each property for the consultation 'vote?	The consultation has been specifically targeted at residents in the properties that are in the proposed zones. We have not approached landlords of rented properties and this falls into the same category.	One vote per eligible property
15	The Council should consult only with owner occupiers, tenants are only temporary.	It is important for the Council to secure the views of people that live and work in the areas affected. This includes tenants in rented accommodation as they will experience the same parking issues as owners of properties.	One vote per eligible property
16	Confusion as to who is responsible for the highways is it Cherwell District Council or Oxfordshire county Council?	The highway authority is Oxfordshire County Council. Any proposals for Residents Parking would first need approval of OCC and this would be set out in an Agency Agreement.	No further action.

<b>17</b>	Perception from attendees is that if 50% of all zones agreed to R P, then R P would be introduced to all zones, even if another zone were against it.	No. Five separate zones have been identified. Any, none or all of these zones could be progressed. Within larger zones it is also possible that boundaries can be changed and this is why the Council are consulting on these initial proposals.	Decision on whether to progress will be taken based on whether residents support a scheme or not.
<b>18</b>	Some felt the consultancy is a smoke screen, and R P will go ahead anyway.	No. The Council will only consider going to a detailed design stage if the proposals are supported by a majority of those responding to the consultation.	Decision on whether to progress will be taken based on whether residents support a scheme or not.
<b>19</b>	No alternative ideas offered to ease parking issues.	This consultation is about residents parking, but it involves OCC as the Highway Authority to ensure that residents concerns are noted and considered further.	The issues that have arisen in the consultation have been raised with OCC as the Highway Authority.
<b>20</b>	Enforcement of vehicle violations committed on street.	This is currently a matter for the police. If Civil Parking Enforcement is introduced then these powers will pass to Cherwell District Council.	No further action.
<b>21</b>	Introduction of a one way system in certain built up areas i.e., Queens and Kings Road, and Beargarden Road.		This matter has been raised with OCC.
<b>22</b>	Only one permit per residency	<p>The issue is really about the need to ensure that residents are satisfied with the outcome of the scheme. Issuing an unlimited number of permits can eventually result in chronic parking problems caused simply by too many residents' vehicles and complaints that residents are paying for a scheme which offers no tangible benefit.</p> <p>Each zone will have a finite capacity and this proposal is for a limit of one permit per property unless the zone can accommodate at least 25% more cars than the number of permits issued at the first stage.</p>	Consider at detailed design stage should permit parking be requested by residents.

		<p>Should additional permits then be available it is suggested that this be on a first come first served basis with no guarantee of a permit in future years.</p> <p>There will always be areas where the number of residents' vehicles (even on a one per property basis) exceeds the capacity of the zone. As the capacity following the introduction of a residents parking scheme is likely to be less than the capacity before the introduction of the scheme residents may prefer the existing free for all – the lesser of the evils argument.</p> <p>As a basis for setting the number of permits available to individual properties for consultation purposes, it is suggested that if the ratio of potential parking spaces to properties is 1.25 or less then the limit should be set initially at one permit per property. The issue of additional permits can be on a first come first served basis as indicated above. If as a result of the initial consultations it becomes apparent that the average number of residents' vehicles per property is lower than anticipated the rules for that zone can be amended.</p>	
<b>23</b>	Reductions for people on low incomes/elderly	In order to keep costs down it is important to keep the scheme as simple as possible. Concessions could be considered, but as this requires a more detailed application process and additional checks to be undertaken it would increase costs to non concessions.	No concessions planned.
<b>24</b>	Causeway/Merton Road one way system unsatisfactory Not a big problem in Causeway (only one resident said that)		This matter has been raised with OCC.
<b>25</b>	Need for restrictions in Old Parr Close due to blocking of car park	The boundary of zones has been drawn to try and take an initial view on likely displacement of cars to adjacent streets.	

	<p>accesses and obstruction at junction</p> <p>Some residents of Old Parr Road and Calthorpe Road did not think they needed to be in the zone as they do not have a problem – however some, but not all, understood the displacement argument.</p>	<p>As the consultation and Traffic Regulation Order process can be time consuming and costly the Council will not be in a position to reconsider streets that are currently included in the consultation for at least two years if residents do not support a scheme at this time.</p>	
<b>26</b>	<p>Concerns about front garden parking and the OCC dimensional rules which prevent some from having footway crossings.</p>	<p>OCC have guidance to ensure safe parking and no overhanging of the highway.</p> <p>With small cars and parking at an angle it is possible for some cars in some properties to park safely where there are dimensions less the OCC's guidelines.</p>	<p>This matter has been raised with OCC.</p>
<b>27</b>	<p>BY4 - concerns about the low capacity of the areas under consideration.</p>		<p>Review in detailed design if there is support for a scheme.</p>
<b>28</b>	<p>Conservation area issues and properties converting front gardens to enable off street parking.</p>	<p>The Council are likely to resist conversions of front gardens for off street parking within conservation areas.</p>	<p>No further action.</p>
<b>29</b>	<p>Roads currently outside the Zone boundaries. Harriers View has been mentioned.</p>	<p>Subject to there being demand from residents in such streets and there is justification then it might be possible to include such streets in the current proposals. However, permit only parking will not solve school parking issues.</p>	
	<p>Issues raised in letters to the Council</p>		

30	Recognise that our staff parking is contributing to the issue of lack of residents parking as we have c 100 staff and only 20 parking places. We are supportive of the proposal if adequate provision is made for our staff to park, albeit at a cost.	<p>The Council operate a number of pay and display car parks around the town centre and offer season tickets at discounts for monthly, quarterly and annual requirements. There are no current plans for further formal pay and display parking although On street pay and display might be an option.</p> <p>There are also privately operated car parks.</p>	No further action.
31	Would not support scheme as it would exacerbate problems for staff and parents dropping children at our school.	The Council have offered to look at paid for short term permits and also suggested use of Ring-go as an other option to school and nursery premises. Neither of these possible options has been taken up.	No further action
32	Provision for disabled residents, disabled parking and blue badge applications	<p>These matters are dealt with by OCC. Details have been forwarded to the enquirer.</p> <p>Information on Blue badges is available on Oxfordshire County Council's website.</p>	No further action.
33	<p>A number of different properties owned in the area which are let. Most of the properties mentioned have their own off-street parking so it would not be necessary for our residents to have this scheme in place.</p> <p>Also narrow roads on which permit parking implemented would create access difficulties for emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>Properties with off street parking will not be eligible to apply for permits so that more on street space is freed up for residents without their own parking.</p> <p>Permit parking will only be introduced on streets where it is safe to do so.</p>	Consider at detailed design stage.
34	Concerns that the scheme will not be enforced	For schemes to be successful they do need effective enforcement. Cherwell District Council does not currently have the powers and this is why the council have said that Civil Parking Enforcement should be in place before residents permit parking is introduced.	No Further action. Pending CPE

<b>35</b>	Property outside the boundary but access to it from street within the boundary and no off street parking.		Need to review if there is support for permit parking in Zone 3.
-----------	---	--	--

### 4.5.1 Zone BY1

- Zone should be sub-divided;
- Cost of permits too high;
- Need more than one permit per property;
- Need a guaranteed space;
- Should not have to pay for visitor permits;
- Need cheaper off street parking to encourage use of car parks (especially NCP operated car parks);
- Need short stay parking for customers of local businesses;
- Need for parking restrictions in some areas to prevent obstructive parking;
- Too many of the new developments have insufficient parking.

### 4.5.2 Zone BY2

- Object to having to pay;
- Cost of permits too high;
- Concerns about the speed of traffic in Beargarden Road;
- Need for enforcement of weight restriction in Beargarden Road;
- Reinstatement of overnight residents' parking in the surgery car parks would be helpful.

### 4.5.3 Zone BY3

- Cost too high;
- Need more than one permit per property;
- Need a guaranteed space;
- Should not have to pay for visitor permits;
- Consider one way system for Queens Road and Kings Road;
- Make Peoples Park car park available to residents for overnight parking.

### 3.5.4 Zone BY4

- Need more than one permit per property;
- Review bus stop locations;
- Review policy on parking in front gardens;
- Consider additional parking in Park Close.

### 3.5.5 Zone BY5

- Object to having to pay;
- Need a guaranteed space;
- Cheaper parking at station;
- Strong enforcement required on Fridays;
- Re-open end of Causeway;
- Review operation of one way system.



## Appendix 5

The initial assessments of the zone capacities are:

<b>ZONE</b>	<b>SUB-ZONE</b>	<b>OVERNIGHT CAPACITY</b>	<b>ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES</b>	<b>RATIO: PROPERTIES/SPACES</b>
BY1		269	149	0.55
BY2		61	70	1.15
BY3		285	260	0.91
BY4	Warwick Road (part) (South side only – nos. 17-35)	11	9	0.82
	Castle Street (north side)	19	27	1.42
	Warwick Road (part) (North side only – nos. 132-190)	28	30	1.07
BY5		406	375	0.92