

A) Background

A1) We agree that restrictions are necessary to deter all-day parking by work-commuters. Problems of double parking, obstruction *etc.* can be dealt with through existing legislation. **This legislation is not currently being properly enforced.**

A2) Our proposals arise from numerous complaints concerning recent CPZs West of City Centre. They attempt to address the problems which have been identified: these include –

- (a) Displacement of congested parking to adjacent unzoned areas.
- (b) Inadequate consideration given to housebound disabled and their carers, GPs, small businesses requiring transport, hotels etc.
- (c) Inadequate provision for Visitors and Tradespeople.
- (d) Extended operating hours/days when commuters would not cause problems.
- (e) Reluctance of residents to pay for the solution of other people's problems (e.g. street lighting, reduction in commuter road traffic).
- (f) Unnecessary expenditure on unwanted and unsightly 'street furniture' *ie* parking meters, numerous signs and bay markings.

A3) We believe that the primary objectives of such schemes should include –

- (a) Reserving adequate parking for residents and for businesses in the zone that require transport.
- (b) Adequate provision for visitors and others with a legitimate need to park in the zone.
- (c) Excluding, or greatly reducing, city-bound commuter parking.
- (d) Minimising capital and continuing expenditure on schemes.
- (e) Revenue neutrality, to minimize charges to local people.

A4) The obvious approach to solving the problems associated with the present schemes is to adjust the details, such as timings and categories of permit. We suggest some appropriate changes in sections **B** and **C**. These alone cannot solve the problem of displacement {A2(a)}, but we also suggest a radically different approach in section **E**.

We do not have the information and expertise to specify every detail exactly, but believe that there should be fewer flaws than have come to light in the present scheme. (Regarding costs, despite several requests we have been unable to obtain a full financial balance sheet for the present scheme.)

A5) Whatever form the final arrangements take, they should be informed by the views of the general public. Proper consultation and open-minded flexibility should make even a defective scheme more acceptable.

During the day some streets have few parked cars and overall there could be 80% empty parking bays, most of the commuters having used nearby unzoned areas. Perhaps the Council did not take into account the fact that a large proportion of car owners drive *out of* the area each day.

Enc1

Permit Parking Zone (PPZ)

Proposals by Residents of Glasgow's West End

The fact that officials are using their discretion in issuing permits outwith the conditions of the existing orders shows a recognition of defects in the present arrangements.

Proposals by Residents of Glasgow's West End

B) Proposals

These proposals, and the Permits listed in section C, are applicable both to the present schemes and to our PPZ

B1) Amalgamation of Zones

The area of restricted parking should not be subdivided. Subdivision is irrelevant to commuting from outside, but does restrict the movements of residents, especially on journeys that do not follow bus routes.

If the present subdivisions of the CPZ are retained, there should be overlaps as proposed by Anthony Hughes at a meeting of the Roads & Lighting Committee. However, it might be satisfactory for permit holders to park freely in any part of an overall PPZ.

B2) Operating Periods

Monday to Friday, only as long as is necessary to prevent 'all-day' commuter parking and to allow sufficient time for traffic wardens to patrol all streets thoroughly.

(For example, the periods might be 1000 to 1300 plus 1400 to 1700 or from 1000 to 1400.)

These times are adequate to exclude/reduce commuter traffic. With suitably chosen timings, wardens could be deployed to patrol each of three adjacent zones for one-hour periods in the morning and afternoon on a 'randomized' schedule.

B3) Exemptions: no permit required

Emergency Services; Police; GPs on call, Disabled Residents holding a Blue Card Health Visitors and Carers (public and private), Royal Mail, Social Services, public service vehicles including minibuses and taxis, Council contractors and employees, *etc.* These categories should already have an indication of their status.

B4) Availability of Permits

Permits should be obtainable in advance by methods other than attending in person at a single outlet. (**The current refusal to post permits – particularly affecting disabled residents – must be reviewed.**) Local Post Offices and shops could be included, and consideration given to ordering on-line: this has relevance to tourists visiting Scotland; *see C6.*

B5) New Buildings

Any new building within the zone (residential or business) should be obliged to provide adequate off-street/on-site parking. This should be a condition of planning consent, and rigorously enforced. Similar conditions should apply to re-developments where practical.

B6) Occupiers of New/Converted Properties

Permits should be available to present local residents and businesses irrespective of when their property was built or converted.

C) Permit Categories

These have been expanded to cater for the categories whose exclusion in the current schemes has led to numerous complaints. The two existing categories are modified. These categories form part of our PPZ scheme, but should also apply as soon as practical in existing schemes.

C1) Resident

Available to residents within a zone. Nominal charge (say £10 *per annum*) for first vehicle in household. A rapidly rising charge should apply to extra vehicles. The nominal charges should be determined by the cost of running the scheme – and only those costs (the Roads [Scotland] Act 1984 section 1.9 stipulates this).

C2) Disabled Resident

Residents who are registered Disabled and hold a Blue Card should retain any existing Disabled bay. New applicants should be allocated a bay as near as practical to their home. A disabled Resident's permit should be transferable to their primary carer living elsewhere, in cases where the resident (perhaps housebound) does not own a vehicle.

C3) Local Business

Available to businesses operating from premises within the zones for vehicles licensed for business purposes at their business address. These also would attract a nominal charge for the first vehicle, perhaps with a rising charge for additional vehicles. (There is plenty of room for these people; this would raise extra income without overloading the roads.)

C4) Visitor/Trade

Issued to residents or local businesses (including hotels, guest houses, GP's surgeries, *etc.*) – even if they do not own a permitted vehicle – to allow visitors or tradesmen to park without penalty on a given day (not just for the current 3 hours). They can be purchased in advance, and must be endorsed indelibly by the resident or business with the date on which they are to be used, and displayed on the visiting vehicle on arrival. Suggested charge £2 per day. *See also F5.*

C5) Worker

Available only to local businesses, to allow employees living outside the zone to park for a day. As with Visitor permits, the business must endorse the permits with the date of use. Suggested charge £2 per day.

C6) Tourist

Tourists from outside Glasgow with no resident-contacts should have some easy means of obtaining permits, perhaps from the Information Centre or VisitScotland's website. There could be a two-week limit on these, and a requirement to provide evidence of living outside of Scotland (or the Central Belt) + registration number of car.

D) Comment

D1) Our proposals outline a more 'joined-up' approach to the city's congestion problems, without unnecessarily penalising residents and local businesses, most of whom already pay Council Tax – and by their presence keep the city alive.

D2) The scheme we advocate next is based on the principle that only vehicles displaying a valid permit may park for more than 30 minutes within the controlled zones during the stated operating periods. Exceptions to this are of course emergency and official vehicles, and various other categories as listed in **B3**).

D3) For this reason, we call these Permit Parking Zone (PPZ) schemes. Such schemes should be the norm for all new zones.

D4) To harmonise the schemes in all applicable areas, existing zones should be converted to this model as soon as practical and at minimal cost. Cost savings will result, and will offset capital expenditure.

D5) As already stated (**B1**), zones are essentially administrative concepts, and should not hinder the movement of permit holders to adjacent similar zones.

D6) Limitations

The zone regulations should not apply to public car parks (*eg* Kelvinbridge Park and Ride) or off-street parking facilities provided by businesses or property developers, or on private roads or privately-owned parking lots (unless requested by the owners).

D7) Penalties

Infringements should attract the maximum penalty allowed under law, including impounding vehicles of persistent offenders.

D8) Charges

The suggested charges for permits (section C) should be in due course revised in the light of available data to aim at revenue neutrality. If not revenue neutral, any temporary excess funds should be ring-fenced for improvement of public transport and roads in the area.

E) PPZ : A radical proposal

E1) The whole West End area (excluding major arterial roads, eg Great Western Road, Dumbarton Road, Byres road) – and any other mainly residential area in the city with congestion problems – should become a group of PPZs. The key features of a PPZ are –

(a) No parking meters.

These represent a considerable capital outlay. They have continuing costs too, since they have to be emptied, and the coins counted. They will also need maintenance, and they are obvious targets for vandals, as were those in Belmont Street recently.

(b) No bay markings.

Marked bays are an inefficient way of allocating available parking space, due to the wide variation in vehicle lengths. They also cost money. Disabled and other special bays, and yellow lines, should be retained. No money should be spent erasing existing bay markings: they would simply not apply.

(c) 'Signage' to be confined to entry points and key internal locations.

A further measure to reduce the prolific amount of 'street furniture' – and the associated costs. There is no need to have signs every few yards. The signs at the entry and key points should however be conspicuous and unambiguous.

(d) Waiting time 30 minutes.

Vehicles without a permit may wait, load/unload, pick up/set down at any single location within the zone for up to 30 minutes at any time without penalty.

E2) On-street parking for periods exceeding 30 minutes within the PPZ during the stated times is permitted only to permit holders as listed in section C.

F) Other Considerations**F1) Displacement**

Both the present schemes and our proposed scheme lead to displacement of commuter parking to outlying marginal areas. However, our scheme can be applied as far outwards as is necessary to reduce the resulting congestion – while minimizing the other difficulties.

F2) Consultation

As well as complaints from CPZs, we have received many from adjacent unzoned areas. Though we know that there is no legal obligation to consult outwith a proposed zone, some account should be taken of its likely impact on surrounding areas.

F3) Expansion

Expansion of the PPZ – once the public has agreed – becomes a relatively straightforward and inexpensive operation. No meters to install or bays to mark. Once permits have been issued (the revenue from these is all up-front) the few signs needed can be installed.

F4) Commuting

The Council should maintain active liaison with other authorities and public transport providers to address the problems caused by out-of town commuters. The provision of “park and ride” facilities near the city boundary should be high on the agenda.

F5) Tracking

Records should be kept of the number of day permits issued to each resident and business in order to track selling-on and other frauds. Our suggested charges should minimise this – it is hardly worth the while.

F6) Temporary permits

Visitor Permits and short-term (30-minute) passes could use scratch cards (as in Garnethill) or cardboard clocks to state the day/time when parking started.

And finally...

We thank you for reading this document, and hope that you will give serious consideration to our proposals.

We propose to distribute leaflets summarising our proposals, and make the full document available on our website.