

## **APPENDIX A**

### **RPS Consultation Comments**

It is clear that the Council have not listened to residents at the last WERA meeting, where residents whose jobs depend on travelling by car were felt to be disadvantaged if living in the same property. The above alternatives therefore do not represent residents' views. If the alternatives contained an option of "two permits per address, or three if all three can demonstrate to be in work" I would have voted for that alternative, since it would represent the views of those in the West End.

Disadvantaging people who are in work, and where jobs depend on the use of a car is not the proper way forwards. I would even be able to live with a "one permit per address, or three if all three can demonstrate to be in work" alternative (the implicit assumption for allowing two permits per address is also based on two people working; why not come clean about that assumption, and implement it in a more rigorous and fairer way?) "to be in work" can easily be demonstrated with a blacked out salary slip to avoid giving away details about income, etc.

Yes there should be a change ideally allowing 2 named permits. Failing this 1 named and 1 visitor. A third permit only for special cases e.g. family/carer. If the final decision is 3. Make them named only to make it difficult and minimise misuse. Any policy should be managed and policed effectively.

I would like it to stay where it states required residents only. I cannot afford a works permit card as I am unemployed. The only thing I don't like if you go out in your vehicle when you come back someone parks in a resident space. Then you have a problem parking.

The scheme to be reduced to 2 permits for households but long term residents (not students) be given flexibility of having 3 (case to be studied)

It's a great shame that Lincoln City Council idea of 'consultation' is to offer just 2 choices and 2 options within the choice. Have you considered asking residents, landlords and business operators if they have any suggestions that the Council might want to consider as an alternative solution to the parking problem. A simple suggestion box under the Councils own "consultation, yes – no tick box" is all it takes to open the debate for more constructive ideas to solve the parking problem.

This needs addressing because people are buying them for work purposes – they get people to buy them and other people use them who aren't staying down our road. Leaving no space for genuine people / residents.

The students seem to use all available spaces and also the 2hr no return spaces. I think this is a great idea. Especially because we need to use our car promptly most days because of disability.

The scheme is being abused – green permits issued by County with no really clear protocols etc.... 2  
Extra suggestions:- 1 We should have clearly marked individual spaces. This can and has been done in Bromley (London). Poor parking wastes much parking room + this would optimise. 2 Review zone – nb Rudgard Lane very difficult + would benefit from being a zone on its own!

Also scheme should cover 7 days. There should be a clampdown on Sunday parking + commuter parking during the week.

Build student parking areas is solution. Cutting resident permits is not the solution as a normal residential household without multi occupancy student lets is not causing your issue. When the students are away parking is not an issue.

I work shifts and when I finish work late in the evening there are no spaces near where I live and have to park quite a distance away. Unsafe as well with current restrictions on lighting the streets.

And also its not right that cars are being parked in permit areas that don't have a permit to park there this is not right when car owners are paying to park in the areas where they live this is something else that should be looked into & also a second permit the price should be reduced. Because they cost too much.

I think residents should be allowed to park in the two hours slots for longer than two hours when there is no other parking available.

I don't have a car. Am disabled. And have personal care, Age UK seven days a week. It is getting increasingly difficult for my carers to park in my St, and Tennyson St

It was clear from the onset that too many passes were available and would easily exceed number of parking places. I wonder if there are any other circumstances where you pay for something with no guarantee you receive anything?! Back door tax on residents

This consultation does not address the real issues which create the problems – especially the students, irresponsible parking and the fact that the scheme only works between 8am and 6pm – so you can't get in when you want to in the evening.

Why is there no comments box? A 'tick box' is not enough. We need 3 permits as we both work outside of Lincoln, so have to have 2 cars, and we have a cleaner, dog walker, friends and family who visit so need a visitors permit.

What type of business? Builder – plumber etc. 2 permits/ Large B&B poss. 3 permits? If you are a pensioner – it's no fun to park a long distance away from your home and have to carry the shopping back. Also a good few of the spaces are taken by builders doing their properties up with lots of vans.

Clarify business if student lets then no more than 2 per house hold guest houses / hotels need more.

In the W. End zones, student cars are a big problem, especially in term time as they stand unused for days on end. The university is within walking or cycling distance. Nottingham Uni bans student cars within a 15 mile radius and Oxford & Oxford Brookes within 10 miles.

Residents are still waiting on a survey to determine whether the “2-hour parking” can be made into a “2-hour parking or residents”! As a result of 2 hours parking, us residents now have less parking spaces.

Students should not be allowed 3 permits per household nor should they be free of charge.

In my view why there isn't enough parking is because of students taking up a lot of the spaces as well as the trees.

It is typical of the City Council to think that the question is so simple. Families who live in the West End with 2 working children still at home may need 3 permits, HMO's with upwards of 6 occupants may have 3-4 cars which sit on the street in the week and are only used at weekends. 2 Permits for HMO's, 3 for households is my suggestion, businesses ½ permits builders should be charged/ticketed as they are often parked illegally or badly why should “working at no x” be an excuse for no permit if council tax paying tenants have to display a permit. The whole scheme is another method for topping up the council tax, every household should be given 1 free pass it is outrageous that out 89 year old neighbour has to buy a pass, she does not own a car or drive but needs a pass for visitors. The lines in our street are poorly marked and to park within them allows people to block the street, restricting bin lorry access and ensuring that cars gets scratched.

Do not want resident parking schemes.

2 permits per household for people who reside in the street

Why not introduce a visitor parking limited to times (ie, visitors can park for 2 hours in evening after 6pm)

It would be preferable if residents on one city centre parking scheme could park in other city centre schemes' zones. E.g. a resident of Monks Road could park on West Parade. This would not increase parking congestion in the city centre because the cars parking in other zones vacate a space in their own zone! It would make the parking scheme better & enable visits to friends during the day, etc. The changes would mean rezoning Lincoln by how close you live.

Why not look at the bigger picture? I.e. hours of operation, areas of City that is covered, how the scheme can be extended. This is just like the Brexit referendum poll

I feel that the scheme should be left as it is if you are living in a road that requires a permit for \*a resident\*. I bought my home because there was parking – (I have no drive or garage) This meant that you paid more for the property. Therefore, maybe if you live in another road, parking perhaps should be limited. (You live in a permit controlled road)

I think it would be useful to mark out space sizes as many spaces are lost due to poor parking. Also households should have to use a permit for waste skips. At times there have been up to 4 waste skips using up parking on out street.

Also the timings of the scheme need changing. Should be covered from 15:00 to 24:00 midnight. It doesn't matter who parks on the street during the day whilst people are at work / college etc, but we need to be able to go out in the evening and be able to park when we get back. As it is we are prisoners in our homes in the evening.

Although I have completed the questionnaire enclosed with your September letter concerning the above, there are a couple of additional points that you may like to consider in addition which have not been covered in your survey: 1. Some other universities make it clear to students that have gained placements, that only "restricted parking" or "no parking" facilities exist at that location, and students are advised not to bring their own transport. The major problem is at its height when the students are attending the University of Lincoln in this area. So would it not be helpful if Lincoln University could conform with the practice currently in existence as several other locations in the UK (We have had personal knowledge of this practice at other locations due to a family member having attended a University elsewhere who was so advised at the locations applied for). There is no problem when the students are not there in Summer! 2. As also outlined to Councillor Murray earlier this year, one additional problem in this street has been added due to Cloud lettings, who have a shop at the junction of Carholme Rd and Depot Street, who were parking up to 3 vehicles on Newland Street West on several days during student term time when it is already overcrowded, despite the fact that on several of those days, alternative empty parking places have existed on Carholme Road not far from their premises. (In addition when visited by a representative of the Council who was doing a survey in this area he did raise the point that he thought it was possible that Cloud lettings had put the Carholme Road address as a "Residents address" but it is unknown whether this was in fact the case despite asking Councillor Murray. 3. I assume that ALL addresses in

the parking scheme area were sent the survey questionnaire. Is this not likely to result in a flawed response? After all, Turkeys are not likely to vote in favour of Christmas, are they?? Similarly, students occupying houses in the parking scheme who have brought cars are unlikely to vote in a reduction in car numbers!! It is, in the main, that PERMANENT residents find themselves unable to park anywhere close to their homes on a lot of occasions as the majority of students who have brought their own cars often leave them parked for 2, 3 or even 4 weeks without having moved them at all, thus “permanently claiming” places at the expense of permanent house holders, some of whom are disabled and suffer hardship as a result on occasions. Another problem encountered with students has been that some of the students resident further away (like Hewson Road or the further end of West Parade e.g.) have often been cruising the area to find a parking space closer to the University during the day to save themselves longer walks, then return to their own areas when completing the days attendance. This also compounds the problem during the day period.

Although nice to have received a consultation document, on closer inspection it is actually a closed question tick box questionnaire, offering only 2 pre-determined options. It is not that one would expect from a “consultation”. The document also does not include any facts and figures to enable the residents to arrive at an informed choice of options. From experience however, the current scheme is simply not working for the long term residents of the West End of Lincoln. There may be similar issued elsewhere in the city too, but having lived in this area of Lincoln for 30 years and owned a car for 29 of those years, I can only comment on the West End. **Prioritising Need** In any civilised society where a resource is in short supply (as is now the situation with parking spaces in the West End of Lincoln), “needs” have to take precedence over “wants”. Many residents need cars, firstly for work and secondly to meet the needs of day to day family life. Under the current scheme however, anyone who wants a permit and meets the qualifying criteria is able to purchase one regardless of whether they actually need one. This does nothing to discourage students from bringing cars with them whilst at University here in Lincoln. The University is not distance at all from the train station or bus station plus a great many students will undoubtedly have parents who car drop off/pick up the individual and their belongings at the start and end of each term. There are supermarkets right next door to the University, sports facilities and entertainment venues on site, pubs, bars and clubs together with great many restaurants nearby also city centre shops. It has to be said that almost everything is within walking distance. City of Lincoln Council urgently needs to approach the University with the aim of drastically reducing the impact that students’ vehicles, which in the vast majority of cases are a luxury rather than a necessity, have on the quality of life of many permanent residents due to there currently being insufficient residents’ parking spaces. In the first instance the University would probably offer to “discourage” students from bringing vehicles with them but this soft approach to the problem has proved ineffective at other universities and should be recognised as an insupportable stalling tactic. Cambridge and Nottingham University have both already banned their students from having cars within a 10 or 15 mile radius so it would seem safe to say that action is ultimately going to be necessary here in Lincoln. For the University not to take appropriate and meaningful action would seem at odds with the transport element of their own published sustainability plan. Residents have already waited long enough to get to the point of being “consulted”. Potentially then seeing the City Council being fobbed off for a year or so by the University to assess whether their discouraging students from bringing vehicles with them to Lincoln had any effect on parking issues for long term residents would be unacceptable. A more effective way to address the problem could perhaps be to place a “no permits to be issued directly” restriction on student rental properties paying no council tax. The city council already have council tax information available such that those addresses can be identified. Then, having dealt with all

other parking permit applications for the area hopefully without the need to impose restrictions on permanent residents, the council could issue a block of permits to the University but only after appropriate calculations had been done to ensure there we don't once again end up with more permits in issue than available spaces. The University student services could then ensure that the small percentage of students with additional needs such that not having use of a vehicle and parking permit would seriously impact on their quality of life were catered for before operating whatever system they chose to allocate the remaining permits. **Other Issues – Hours of operation** Given that the parking restrictions cease at 6pm each evening (Mon – Sat), if residents have working hours or other commitments preventing them from getting home by 6pm each evening they risk having no parking space available to them as anyone can park overnight (6pm to 8am) without a permit at all. Sundays are a free. What are residents supposed to do? They still need to be able to park on a Sunday too and any trip out in a car runs the risk of not finding a parking space when returning.

**Visitors' bays (required by law?)** If no residents' spaces are available but there are spaces free in a visitors' bay, why are residents issued with parking fines for using the visitors' spaces? It is rather trying to have to leave spaces free just in case someone who has not paid for a permit wants to use them for a couple of hours whilst permit holding residents have to continue to drive around streets further away hoping to find a place elsewhere. Frustration really increases when a resident then has to make several trips back and forth to the distant parked car to unload anything that can't be managed in one trip. **Rationing** If permits have to be rationed because the City Council is not prepared to tackle the issue of students' vehicles, then might the following points be considered:

**Dropped Kerbs** If a household has a dropped kerb in a stretch of road forming a residents parking bay, they are effectively making a residents parking scheme place unavailable to anyone outside of that particular household as anyone parking in front of such a property would be committing the rather unneighbourly act of either blocking access to the off road parking space or alternatively blocking the neighbours' vehicle inside the off road parking space. Surely having a dropped kerb allowing access to off road parking should mean that any property with a dropped kerb is restricted to just one residents parking permit specific to the space relating to the dropped kerb area. **Council**

**Tax Single Person Discount Households** If residents are to be rationed to a maximum of 2 permits per household, irrespective of the fact that there may be 2 working parents both needing cars for their jobs and an adult child living with them who also needs a car for work purposes, then it makes sense to ensure that any household benefitting from the Single Person Council Tax discount is restricted to just one permit.

### **Response to key points.**

#### **Why hasn't there been a wider consultation to invite views to find a solution?**

The Council have promoted two options for consideration, and are always open to receiving comments at any time. Given the number of responses (as attached here) it is clear that consultation has not been stifled, and there is no reason to believe that another consultation would identify any other suggestions not promoted in feedback already received.

#### **Use of 'evidence of need' to be provide to justify a permit.**

It would be extremely difficult to assess genuine 'need' for a car with any accuracy as it would require investigation into personal circumstances. Even if public transport options were available they may not suit an individual's requirements or social needs. A decision on whether a car is

essential for one person's employment may be clear in some cases, but would be impossible to assess on equitable grounds in most other. Additionally, the resources available, and might only be attempted with significant additional resource, which would of course add to the costs of administering the scheme, making it less attractive to residents.

If having a job were to be used as a requirement for having a car this might be an option operationally, but it would require more work, and would doubtless be open to simple fraudulent claims. Additional resources would be required to carry out checks.

Additionally, and most importantly. Legal Services have advised that it would be a decision open to legal challenge on the basis of discrimination against students.

### **Why don't we exclude students?**

Identifying students' accommodation would be a difficult task and require the development of information sharing agreements suitable and justifiable for this work.

Legal Services have advised that it would be a decision open to legal challenge on the basis of discrimination against students.

The university have been approached about discouraging student use of cars, and they are considering how they can strengthen existing advice to this effect.

### **Why aren't specific spaces marked out?**

Specific bays are not marked out due to the range in lengths of current vehicles. By marking bays out it could reduce the numbers of vehicles accessing the overall kerb space, therefore this would not make best use of the spaces available.

### **The scheme should be in operation on Sundays too.**

Sundays have been excluded as the majority of the competing parking demand has come from commuters and shoppers who are mainly active during Monday to Saturday.

### **There should be more enforcement.**

Although the City council provides the scheme and permits, the county Council are the authorised body for enforcement, as a part of the wider 'traffic warden' duties. They are provided with any feedback received about the standards of enforcement seen.

### **Why don't you build an area for student parking?**

There is no opportunity to build a car park for students, and the council would not fund such works.

Legal Services have advised that it would be a decision open to legal challenge on the basis of discrimination against students.

The university have been approached about discouraging student use of cars, and they are considering how they can strengthen existing advice to this effect.

### **Can the hours of operation be extended?**

The Council is aware of this pressure and is anticipating being able to undertake a consultation on this at a later stage, subject to the outcome of this consultation.

**There is a need for visitors/carers/friends to visit. How is this to be managed?**

Within the zones are 2 hr waiting bays, also residents can have an annual visitor permit (counts towards permit total per property) or they can purchase daily scratch cards.

**Why can't the 'two hour' bays be used by residents?**

The County Council highways authority design in 2hr bays for visitors etc . If permit holders could park there, this facility would be removed and affect traffic flow, more circulating traffic etc.

**What do hotels and guest houses do if there are just two passes available?**

There are current RPS rules for guest houses/small hotels – There is the availability of one permit per guest bedroom less any off-street spaces at the property.

**Why not have 2 Permits for HMO's, 3 for households.**

Some HMOs have local residents in them, all of whom work. This proposal would therefore require us to separate categories of HMOs and their residents, which could not be done and would be potentially discriminatory.

**"our 89 year old neighbour has to buy a pass, she does not own a car or drive but needs a pass for visitors"**

The best solution for this would be either to purchase an annual visitor pass or if visits are not frequent, daily scratch cards.

**Why can't an RPS permit allow you to park in any zone?**

The zones have been designed to provide an area around a number of streets to allow increased parking opportunity nearer the residence. Use of any zone would see an increase of parking towards the city centre. The Council moved away from all zone daily scratch cards to designated zone daily scratch cards as there were complaints of increased parking in streets adjacent to the city centre.

**Waste skips should need permits.**

They do. As this is on the highway, permits have to be issued by the highway authority.

**Dropped kerbs should get less permits, as they can get a car off the road.**

Authorising dropped kerbs is a highways issue. It is not something that the City Council has resources to actively monitored. To do so would add costs to the scheme.

**Houses with single person discount should only be able to claim one permit**

A single occupant may have regular family members/carers visiting daily. Such a policy would, in the main, impact the elderly. See previous question re aged resident.