

**Report to the Cabinet**

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 7 September 2023

**Report of the Director of Highways and Transport**

**Part I**

Electoral Divisions affected:  
Lancaster Central; Lancaster  
East; Preston City; Preston  
Central East; Preston Central  
West; Preston South East;

**Corporate Priorities:**  
Delivering better services;

**Amendment to Permit Parking and Pay & Display Provisions, Revocations and Introduction of Permit Parking Places, Pay and Display Parking, Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting, Prohibition of Loading, Limited Waiting Parking Places and Disabled Parking in Preston City and Lancaster**

(Appendices 'A' to 'P2' refer)

Contacts for further information:

Tracey Price, Tel: (01772) 538098, Traffic Policy & Network Management Engineer,  
[tracey.price@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:tracey.price@lancashire.gov.uk)

Maggie Isherwood, Tel: (01772) 536979, Residents Parking Engineer,  
[maggie.isherwood@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:maggie.isherwood@lancashire.gov.uk)

**Brief Summary**

Following investigations and formal public consultation it is proposed to make the following three Traffic Regulation Orders to introduce various parking restrictions:

- Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Preston City Area) (Revocation and Introduction Of Parking Places) Order 202\*.
- Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Preston City Area) (Revocation, Prohibition and Restriction Of Waiting, Prohibition Of Loading, Limited Waiting Parking Places and Disabled Parking Places) Order 202\*.
- Lancashire County Council (Lancaster and Preston City) (Amendment To Permit Parking Provisions) Order 202\*.

The proposals are to:

- Amend the current Permit Parking Order to define exact residential address points for eligible properties.



- Where possible increase highway space that could be utilised for the use of 'Permit Parking' creating a further 158 spaces across the Preston permit areas.
- Increase the availability of short term on-street Pay & Display Parking within close proximity to the City Centre creating a further 30 spaces.
- Introduce a new BG1 Permit Zone in the Broadgate Area covering Grafton Street, Lauderdale Street, Hind Street and a section of South Meadow Lane.
- Extend the current DP1 Permit Zone to include Church Avenue, Fishwick Parade and Beaconsfield Avenue.
- Remove the restrictions within the St Mark's area and Queens Road areas and introduce new restrictions to assist with dangerous/obstructive parking and the free flow of traffic.
- Amend the Pay & Display charges from Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm to Monday-Sunday 8am-6pm.
- Increase the Pay and Display tariffs.

In addition to the Permit Zones and City Centre Pay & Display reviews, the proposal also redefines the descriptions of the existing restrictions in the area to allow for effective enforcement along with introducing some additional No Waiting and No Loading restrictions where parking would compromise safety. The measures contained in the three proposed Orders form a comprehensive suite of measures and consideration of all three Orders together is advised.

This is deemed to be a Key Decision and the requirements of Standing Order C19 have been complied with.

### **Recommendation**

Cabinet is asked to approve the proposals for new and existing restrictions on the various lengths of road as detailed within this report and as set out in the Draft Orders, Appendices 'A3', 'B3' and 'C3', for the reasons outlined in the Statement of Reasons at Appendices 'D1' and 'D2'.

### **Detail**

The measures contained in the three proposed Orders form a comprehensive suite of measures and consideration of all three Orders together is advised.

Due to various developments including the conversion of large town houses and former public buildings into residential flats it has become necessary to redefine the eligible address points to manage the increasing pressure on available permit spaces and avoid the resident permit schemes being overwhelmed.

These proposals in the first and second Orders will define exact residential address points instead of the generic 'All properties' thus stopping the new developments automatically becoming eligible for permit parking.

Along with the eligibility, consideration has been given to any possible increase in highway space that could be utilised for the use of 'Permit Parking' whilst still



providing short stay 'Pay and Display' and Free Limited Waiting parking within the city centre, taking into account the increased demand for parking in the city centre from visitors to the city.

All the Preston Permit Zones were reviewed with amendments being proposed as detailed in the Statement of Reasons at Appendix 'D'.

In addition to the review of the permit bays within the AV1 area, consideration has been given to the availability and cost of short term on-street Pay & Display Parking within close proximity to the city centre.

These changes, as detailed on the Statement of Reasons at Appendix 'D', will increase the parking provision in the city centre and ensure there is a regular turnover of parking spaces to enable residents, shoppers, visitors, and workers access to the city.

The third proposed Order further amends the Pay & Display charges from Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm to Monday-Sunday 8am-6pm and increases the tariffs to a higher price than compared to car park prices at the same location to encourage visitors to the city to use the off-street parking facilities as far as possible in preference to parking on-street.

## Appendices

The Draft Orders are included as appendices to this report, however due to the number of Plans associated with these proposals the appendices only relate to the elements of the proposals that have received correspondence in response to the formal consultations. A copy of all plans and associated documents in relation to the proposed making of these Orders are available on Lancashire County Council's website at: <https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-travel/roads/roadworks-and-traffic-regulation-orders/permanent/proposed-traffic-regulation-orders-tros/>

Appendices 'A1' - 'P2' are attached to this report. For clarification they are summarised below and referenced at relevant points within this report.

Appendix	Title
Appendix 'A1'	Draft Order - Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Preston City Area) (Revocation And Introduction Of Parking Places) Order 202* - Order Reference 894.15602
Appendix 'A2'	Notice of Modification Order Reference 894.15602
Appendix 'A3'	Modified Draft Order - Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Preston City Area) (Revocation And Introduction Of Parking Places) Order 202* - Order Reference 894.15602
Appendix 'B1'	Draft Order - Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Preston City Area) (Revocation, Prohibition And Restriction Of Waiting, Prohibition Of Loading, Limited Waiting Parking Places And Disabled Parking Places) Order 202* Order Reference 894.15603
Appendix 'B2'	Notice of Modification Order Reference 894.15603
Appendix 'B3'	Modified Draft Order - Lancashire County Council (Lancaster



	And Preston City) (Amendment To Permit Parking Provisions) Order 202* - Order Reference 894.15603
Appendix 'C1'	Draft Order - Lancashire County Council (Lancaster And Preston City) (Amendment To Permit Parking Provisions) Order 202* - Order Reference 894.15864
Appendix 'C2'	Notice of Modification Order Reference 894.15864
Appendix 'C3'	Modified Draft Order - Lancashire County Council (Lancaster And Preston City) (Amendment To Permit Parking Provisions) Order 202* - Order Reference 894.15864
Appendix 'D1'	Original Statement of Reasons
Appendix 'D2'	Modifications Statement of Reasons
Appendix 'E1'	AV1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'E2'	Modified AV1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'F1'	AV3 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'F2'	Modified AV3 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'G1'	BG1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'G2'	Modified BG1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'H'	BR1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'I1'	DP1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'I2'	Modified DP1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'J'	HR1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'K'	ML2 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'L'	QR1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'M'	SA1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'N1'	SP1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'N2'	Modified SP1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'O1'	SM1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'O2'	Modified SM1 Permit Zone Plans
Appendix 'P1'	Pay and Display Parking Plans
Appendix 'P2'	Modified Pay and Display Parking

## Consultations

Formal consultation was carried out between 20 January 2023 and 17 February 2023 and advertised in the local press. Notices were displayed on site for all areas where new restrictions are proposed. Divisional county councillors were consulted along with the council's usual consultees and the consultation documents posted on the council's website.

Notices were not placed at the locations of the existing restrictions where no material change to the restrictions as currently indicated on site were proposed.

Having considered the consultation responses, modifications to the advertised proposals were advertised between 30 June 2023 and 28 July 2023. Details of this consultation are contained within Appendix 'D2' and have the following effects:

- Change to the eligibility in the AV1 Permit Zone.
- Change to the eligibility in the AV2 Permit Zone.



- Amendment to the description of the Permit Bay on the south section of East Cliff Road in the AV3 Permit Zone along with new description of the current Limited Waiting Bay and single yellow line restriction with no material change to the restrictions or their extents.
- Amendment to the proposed BG1 Permit Zone to allow for unrestricted parking for permit holders along with a 1-hour Parking limit to facilitate parking for customers to the local shop and short-term parking for visitors to the residents of the area.
- Removal of the proposed mixed BG1 Permit Holder and Limited Waiting Bay on the north side of South Meadow Lane to allow sufficient carriageway width for larger vehicles to pass.
- Removal of the proposed double yellow lines within the DP1 Permit Zone on the northern end of Church Avenue to allow unrestricted parking for visitors to the businesses located on New Hall Lane.
- Removal of sections of the proposed restrictions within the St Marks Road area allowing additional unrestricted parking for the residents and visitors to the area, whilst maintaining the current 1-hour Limited Waiting bays along with reduced Prohibition of Waiting restrictions in areas where road safety may be compromised.
- Change to the eligibility in the WC1 Permit Zone.
- Deferral of the introduction of the consulted proposals within the SP1 Permit Zone to allow for a further review of the area. This modification relates to the changes to the restrictions on site, with the exception of the removal of the Doctors Bays which are no longer required due to the closure of the Doctors practice on East Street and maintains the redefining of the eligible address points for the zone to avoid the scheme becoming further overwhelmed.
- The introduction of a 2-hour tariff for the City Centre Pay and Display to facilitate short stay parking for visitors to the city and a sufficient time period for people to practice their religion at the number of places of worship around the city centre.
- Reduction to the proposed Pay and Display parking on Guildhall Street along with extending the Prohibition of Waiting and Loading to allow sufficient manoeuvring space for vehicles to access/egress private off-street parking in the area.

## Objections

As a result of both consultations, 87 responses, including 2 petitions were received regarding the three proposed Orders.

The comments regarding the items in the proposed orders are split into areas and detailed as follows along with the engineer's comments as they are relevant.



## General Objections

Two pieces of general correspondence were received in relation to the proposals as detailed below:

- The first objection was on the grounds that the proposals are not legal, stating the following reasons:
  1. The order is in breach of the provisions made by the Traffic Management Act 2004 s. 33 which prescribes that in England such permit schemes as defined in s. 32 are prepared and regulated by the appropriate national authority for England (s. 39). The Director of Law and Governance is not the appropriate national authority for England.
  2. Lancashire County Council have overstepped the boundaries of article 5.
  3. The order is in breach of the Traffic Management Act 2004 s. 32 which restricts permit schemes in England to the undertaking of roadworks.
  4. The notice generated by Lancashire County Council does not fulfil any of the criteria set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 s.14 (2).
  5. S.15 (1a and 1b) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 states that traffic regulation notices cannot exceed the period of 6 months in specified cases and a maximum of 18 months for everything else.

## Officers Comments

The objector's comments are noted, however sections of the Traffic Management Act 2004 specified by the objector are in relation to Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders with regards to permits to carry out works and does not cover permits relating to paid for on street parking as these come under sections 45 and 46 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Section 14 and 15 (1a and 1b) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 also relates to Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders and is irrelevant to these proposals as these are not temporary orders and as such come under sections 1, 2, 4, 45 and 46 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

- The second Objector stated that they object to any increase in residents only parking specifically in the following streets:

Clarendon Street, Cross Street, Avenham Lane, Bairstow Street, Camden Place, Chaddock Street, Ribblesdale Place, Starkie Street, Fishwick Parade, Great Avenham Street, Lancaster Road North, Moor Lane, Oxford Street, South Meadow Lane, St Austin's Place and Winckley Square.

The objector did not specify any specific reasons for the objection.



## **Officers Comments**

The council is committed to the promotion of encouraging sustainable travel in new residential city centre locations, however, these proposals are in relation to existing residential permit parking areas which have historically been oversubscribed.

The objector's comments have been noted; however, these proposals seek to address the current pressures on available permit parking spaces within the Preston area whilst still maintaining sufficient parking provisions for visitors to the city centre and restrictions where road safety may be compromised.

## **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

### **AV1 Permit Zone and Pay & Display Drawing No. 22-23 (1)/RPH-AV1 and No. 22-23 (1)/RPH-AV1(S) Appendices 'E1' and 'E2'**

Seven responses were received in relation to the proposed changes around the AV1 permit parking area regarding permit parking and pay and display parking as detailed below:

- **Chaddock Street Objection**

Correspondence was received from a local resident suggesting that the AV1 Permit Holders Only parking in the Cul-De-Sac part of Chaddock Street where it meets Cross Street could be increased in size by 4 or 5 metres to allow for 1 or 2 more spaces.

The objector also suggests that as this section of the street is not a through route the area could be wholly allocated to the parking requirements of properties immediately adjacent to the cul-de-sac and parking permissions granted to AV1 residents.

## **Officers Comments**

The objector's comments regarding additional spaces for permit holders are noted, however, there is insufficient space at this specific location to introduce a permit parking bay due to road safety considerations in the immediate vicinity.

Officers would however advise that a further 14 spaces have been proposed at other locations within the AV1 permit parking area.

## **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

- **Cross Street Objections**

Two objections were received in connection with the proposals to convert the current 30-minute limited waiting on Cross Street to short-term pay and display parking.



- The first objector states that they would be unwilling to agree to the pay and display being proposed along Cross Street stating that the area does not need additional on street parking when there are not enough spaces for permanent residents and suggests that these spaces be wholly allocated to the parking requirements of properties immediately adjacent to the cul-de-sac part of Chaddock Street and parking permissions granted to AV1 residents.
- The second objector states that the number of resident parking bays has increased substantially in recent years and believes that the whole point of city centre living is to utilise public transport links, so by increasing resident bays, the Council is encouraging private car use.

The objector suggests that resident bays need to be reduced and not increased. However, they also object to the loss of the current 30 minutes free parking on Cross Street which supports local businesses and believes they should remain and a similar arrangement should be extended by reducing residents parking bays in the area.

### **Officers Comments**

The council is committed to the promotion of encouraging sustainable travel in new residential city centre locations. However, these proposals are in relation to existing residential permit parking areas which have historically been oversubscribed.

These proposals aim to address the current pressures on available permit parking spaces within the AV1 Permit area. The total amount of on street parking on Cross street only increases by three spaces with the change of use from the bus stop to pay and display. Whilst permit parking is sought after, the AV1 scheme does see an increase of 14 spaces throughout the zone.

The objector's comments have been noted; however, a balance of bays needs to be maintained to meet the conflicting needs of the road users. In addition to the increase in permit holder parking spaces, the pay and display sees an increase in spaces throughout the City Centre and an increase of duration to 2 hours for visitors to the area resulting in 59% of available parking reserved for Permit Holder Parking and 35% allocated to Pay and Display Parking to allow for short-term parking for visitors. The remaining 6% of available parking is reserved for Blue Badge Holders, use by electric vehicles and general short term free parking.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

- **Winckley Square (south) Objections**

Two objections were received in relation to the proposal to convert the current 2-space AV1 Permit Bays on Winckley Square (South) at the southeast corner of Winckley Square to pay and display parking.





- The first objector stated that they could not understand the logic of the reasoning for the removal of the permit bays as being to 'reduce confusion' when the permit bay at the northwest corner of the square is to remain. The objector believes that it appears the council do not consider the bay located on Winckley Square (north) causes confusion, thereby suggesting that there are two opposed logics.

The objector suggests retaining the Permit bay will also save money, by not having to change the signs and alter the road markings.

- The second objection was received on the grounds that currently all except two bays in the south east corner are already pay and display and they believe that the proposed change will simply add two more bays to a stretch of road which is never fully occupied between 8am and 6pm adding capacity where there is little or no demand.

The objector states that there are a number of family homes on the south side of Winckley Square, all with long-established single-family residents and that the permit bay facility is useful, especially when needing to load/unload heavy items.

The objector believes that there is no evidence of a spike in confusion related to the two bays, the signage is clear and the bays are clearly marked stating that there are few penalty charge notices issued in these bays which suggests people are not confused.

The objection includes a statement that they would have expected Lancashire County Council Highways to have carried out an Equality Impact Assessment before publishing the proposals, however none were included in the documents provided.

The objector suggests an indirect discrimination will ensue from the proposal to remove the two permit bays due to residents on Winckley Square South being most likely affected by the loss of nearby bays being elderly. The objector states that the properties on Starkie Street where the additional permit bays are being proposed have barely one property occupied by a single family and as far as they are aware there are no elderly residents.

The objector believes that the flats and houses in multiple occupation in the area are almost exclusively occupied by younger people, yet it is this younger cohort of residents who will have additional bays created outside their homes whilst the older cohort have their nearest bays removed resulting in an unintended consequence of discriminating against older residents.

The Objector states that the provisions as currently on site have worked without incident for as long as they can remember, therefore requests that the two existing residents' bays are retained.



## **Officers Comments**

Where possible the council prefers to maintain single extents of restrictions to mitigate any possible confusion by the public. The comments from the objector regarding confusion have been noted and ideally the northern bay would be moved as well as the southern bay. However, the location of alternative permit bays for the users are significantly different in distance to those for Winckley Square (south).

The nearest alternative bay from the north is approximately 265 metres away whereas the south permit bay which is being proposed for removal has alternative permit parking being created 26 metres away on Starkie Street.

Officers acknowledge that the permit bay facility is useful, especially when needing to load/unload heavy items. However, the proposed pay and display parking also allows for loading/unloading activities and also benefit Blue Badge holders who can continue to park without charge or time limit.

Based on the requirements for access for Blue Badge holders this is not felt to be an unreasonable distance and provides clear single use bays where possible.

## **"Equality and Cohesion/Equality Impact Assessment"**

The requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty are to ensure that "due regard" is given to its three principles which are to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010; to advance equality of opportunity for groups who share relevant protected characteristics; and to foster good relations between groups who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not share them. This includes assessing the potential impact of relevant proposals on groups with protected characteristics which are age (younger or older people), disability, gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership status, pregnancy or maternity, race, religion or belief, sex/gender and sexual orientation.

In the case of age (older people) it has been stated that the relocation of the Residents Parking Bays from Winckley Square (south) to Starkie Street and their replacement with Pay and Display spaces will adversely impact some residents of Winckley Square (south) particularly as they will need to walk further for a Residents Permit space and may find it more difficult to load and unload items close to their residence.

Whilst it is noted that there are currently a number of older people resident in the area closest to the current Winckley Square South spaces, the proposals provide sufficient spaces within close walking distance (26 metres). The proposals to change two spaces from residents parking to pay and display parking does not impact on the ability of older people generally to use these spaces – older people visiting businesses in the area, for example, will potentially benefit for the additional pay and display spaces.

## **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.



- **Camden Place Objections**

Two Objections were received in relation to the removal of the current free 2-hour Limited Waiting parking bay situated between Winckley Square and Back Camden Place and converting it to short stay pay and display parking.

The grounds submitted by the objectors are that the bay is currently very well used by people visiting local residents or short trips into town, and as such believe it should remain in place as there is little other parking for family and friends visiting.

The objector suggests that if the bay is to be changed then it should be reassigned as AV1 Permit Holders so that the whole length of Camden Place is AV1 to ensure that there is no confusion on the length of the street, which they state currently occurs. This is similar to the proposal on Winckley Square to remove the two AV1 bays and convert them to pay and display to prevent confusion.

### **Officers Comments**

Where possible the council prefers to maintain single extents of restrictions to mitigate any possible confusion by the public. The comments regarding confusion have been noted, but there is a difference between the permit bay on Winckley Square South and the current Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm 2-hour Limited Waiting parking bay located on Camden Place as this is already a single extent restriction.

Following a modification to the proposed Pay and Display parking, the bay will still allow 2-hour parking to be used by people visiting local residents or short trips into town, and also allows for loading/unloading activities to take place.

The change to pay and display from unrestricted (as it currently is on a Sunday) will require the city centre shop workers to locate to alternative parking in the city centre thereby keeping the spaces available for visitors to the City and also benefit Blue Badge holders who can continue to park without charge or time limit.

In addition to the change of the 5-space Limited Waiting Bay on Camden Place the proposals also introduce a further 12 Permit Holder Only spaces on Starkie Street.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

### **Objection to Modification – Bairstow Street permit eligibility**

Three objections were received in response to the modification to remove No.12 Bairstow Street as a single dwelling and reintroduce to include flats 1-6 on the grounds that the proposed change would enable 24 parking permits for No.12 as opposed to the 4 that can be issued to a single household, which would considerably exacerbate the current parking problems in the area.

The objector states that the development of houses in multiple occupation around Winckley Square and Cross Street has increased the demand for parking spaces in the vicinity resulting in the demand for parking in the AV1 Permit area being at an all-



time high, especially on Bairstow Street with residents and visitors from other streets within the zone parking on Bairstow Street.

One of the objectors also comments that both No.12 and No.21 have recently been converted from a single dwelling in to houses in multiple occupation to which objections were made to the planning application at the time.

### **Officers Comments**

The objectors' comments have been noted; however, No.12 Bairstow Street is divided into six separate flats all registered for council tax as individual properties.

The allocation of Resident Permits is currently 2 permits per property with the option to purchase 2 additional permits for the use by visitors. As the flat at No.12 are individual address points each flat will be entitled to the full permit allocation. However, No.21 is registered for council tax as 1 property of multiple occupancy and therefore is only entitled to 2 permits with the option to purchase 2 additional permits for the use by visitors for the whole property.

Officers would however advise that a further 14 spaces have been proposed at other locations within the AV1 permit parking area.

A residents' parking scheme restricts the number of people parking in a given area either over a restricted period of time or all of the time. People are only able to park in the area over the period of operation and whilst displaying a valid parking permit for that area. Purchasing a residents parking permit will not reserve exclusivity to the parking space outside individual properties nor will it guarantee a parking space within the residents parking scheme permit area. It will however, due to the need to display a permit, restrict the vehicles allowed to park and therefore should improve the possibility of finding parking spaces within the authorised area.

With regards to the planning applications, this is undertaken through Preston City Council which is the planning authority and therefore the county council is unable to comment on any objections regarding decisions relating to houses in multiple occupation.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

**BG1 Permit Zone - Broadgate Area New Permit Parking Zone  
Drawing Nos.22-23(1)/RPH-BG1A, 22-23(1)/RPH-BG1A(S)  
22-23(1)/RPH-BG1B and 22-23(1)/RPH-BG1B(S)  
Appendices 'G1' and 'G2'**

Three responses were received to the proposals to introduce a new BG1 Permit Parking area as follows:



- **Lauderdale Street / Grafton Street – Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-BG1A and No.22-23(1)/RPH-BG1A(S)**

Two objections were received in relation to the proposals highlighted in Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-BG1A.

- The first objection was received from the local shop in Lauderdale Street on the grounds that half of their customers travel by car and the proposed restrictions will be a great hinderance to both the shop and their customers. The objector appealed for some spaces to be allocated specifically for customers to the shop.
- The second objection was received from a local resident in Grafton Street on the grounds that they believe that the introduction of permit parking does not benefit its residents but allows the council to charge homeowners for the benefit of parking in front of their properties.

### **Officers Comments**

Having considered the consultation responses, a modification to the consulted proposals was carried out between 30 June 2023 and 28 July 2023 to amend the proposed Permit Holder Only Parking on Grafton Street, Lauderdale Street and Hind Street to Permit Holders or 1 Hour Limited Waiting to facilitate parking for customers to the local shop along with free short-term parking for visitors to the residents of the area.

In addition, the modification reduces the length of proposed Prohibition of Waiting on the north side of Hind Street to allow for additional parking spaces whilst still maintaining the restrictions where road safety may be compromised.

The objector's comments regarding permit parking being a lack of benefit to resident, allowing the council to charge homeowners for the benefit of parking outside their properties has been noted.

However, the Lancashire County Council Residents Parking Scheme has been introduced to provide a consistent and considered approach to requests for new schemes with officers acknowledging the significant consensus of opinion in the area from local residents regarding parking issues.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the revised measures are implemented.

- **South Meadow Lane – Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-BG1B and No.22-23(1)/RPH-BG1B(S)**

Correspondence was received from Preston City Council making the following observations to the proposals on **South Meadow Lane** highlighted in Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-BG1B.



- The city council welcomes the proposals to introduce No Waiting restrictions at the access/egress to the car park across from the Continental as visibility from this car park is severely restricted due to vehicles parking close to the access point on the north side of South Meadow Lane.
- The city council supports the introduction of the resident parking bays on the south side of south Meadow Lane outside the properties. However, it is concerned that the proposed limited waiting bay on the carriageway on the north side will not allow for larger vehicles to pass between the two bays.

The correspondence confirms that the comments are neither objections nor representations, but observations only.

### **Officers Comments**

Having considered the consultation responses, a modification to the consulted proposals was carried out between 30 June 2023 and 28 July 2023 to remove the proposed Mixed BG1 Permit Holder Only and Limited Waiting Bay parking bay on the north side of South Meadow Lane to allow sufficient carriageway width for larger vehicles to pass.

These proposals maintain the proposed Prohibition of Waiting at the access/egress to the car park along with the proposed BG1 Permit Holder Only Bay outside the residential properties.

Officers acknowledge that the width of the carriageway on South Meadow Lane at this location does not support parking on both sides and these proposals do not prevent it. However, although there is no Traffic Regulation Order to support both sides, the council does not condone footway parking.

### **Objection to Modification**

One objection was received with regards to the modified proposals in relation to the BG1 Permit Zone however no specific grounds were given.

### **Officers Comments**

Officers are satisfied that the change from Permit Holders Only to a mixed Permit Holders and a 1 Hour Limited Waiting Period for visitors to the area is beneficial to the residents and businesses in the area. This modification will facilitate parking for customers to the local shop along with short term parking for visitors to the residents of the area.

No further responses were received in relation to the modified proposals.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the revised measures are implemented.



**BR1 Permit Zone**  
**Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-BR1 and No.22-23(1)/RPH-BR1(S)**  
**Appendix 'H'**

Two responses were received in relation to the proposals highlighted in Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-BR1.

- **Shelley Road**

Two objections from local residents were received to the proposals on Shelley Road on the grounds the proposals appear to remove the yellow line across from the Permit Holder Only Bays in Shelley Road between Blackpool Road and Arnott Road which would cause congestion on Shelley Road. The objections stated that the 'resident permit zone' was originally introduced due to staff working at Tulketh Mill parking in every available space to avoid using the mill's car park, and that this made it impossible for residents to park anywhere near their homes.

Both objections raised concerns that they believed the removal of the yellow lines will result in an increase in people working at the mill parking their cars on the residential street making it difficult for residents once again to park near their homes.

- The first objector also stated that some residents are parking on the current yellow lines with two wheels up on the pavement which has resulted in the bin lorry not being able to get past them and residents' bins not being emptied. Further correspondence was received from the objector with a snippet of a news article from iNews on pavement parking.

The objector also stated that they already have staff from the local businesses parking in the Permit Holder Only and time limited bays in and around Shelley Road and believes that the area never seems to get any enforcement.

In addition, the objector commented that the residents are planning to get together and park their own cars free of charge on the opposite side of the road, not bothering to purchase any permits.

- The second objector stated that if the single yellow line is removed and cars park on the opposite side, if they park with all 4 wheels on the road there will be very little room for larger vehicles such as waste removal trucks and delivery vans. However, if they park with 2 wheels on the pavement, as some already do, then the pavement is restricted for pushchairs and mobility scooters/wheelchairs.

The objector also stated that currently vehicles are parking in the Permit Bays close to their driveway and is concerned that if cars are parked on the opposite side of the road, they will not be able to get onto or leave the driveway.

**Officers Comments**

These proposals are as a result of a review of Limited Waiting bay usage in the area where it was determined that the area would benefit from converting the Limited



Waiting Bays on Balcarres Road and Briggs Road to 'BR1 Permit Holders Only' resulting in a further 9 Permit spaces.

The plan that accompanies the proposal only shows the restrictions to which changes are being proposed with no changes proposed with regards to the current No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm single yellow line restriction opposite the residential properties on Shelley Road.

The comments regarding the lack of enforcement in the area have been noted. However, given the pressure on enforcement resources, officers are satisfied with the level of enforcement over the last 12 months of 297 visits resulting in 46 penalty charge notices being issued.

In reply to the two responses officers wrote to the objectors confirming that the yellow line in the areas of concern was not being removed and advising on the enforcement data for the area.

The objectors have also been advised that the implementation of H Bars to assist with additional obstructive parking can be requested via the county councils traffic team.

Following confirmation of the above to the respondents one objection has subsequently been withdrawn.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

### **DP1 Permit Zone**

#### **Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-DP1 and No.22-23(1)/RPH-DP1(S) Appendices 'I1 and 'I2'**

Five responses were received in response to the proposals relating to the DP1 Permit Zone as follows:

- **Fishwick Parade**

One objection was received from a local resident of Fishwick Parade on the grounds that they do not agree to having to have a permit to park outside their house as the area has never been a permit zone and to pay £25 for a permit is not acceptable especially with the current cost of living.

The objector also states that the proposal is unfair as the other part of Fishwick Parade will not be charged for parking and believes that it is a money-making scheme for the council at the expense of residents who use their cars suggesting that there must be another solution to the issues.

### **Officers Comments**

Due to parking problems at the location associated with local businesses a review of the DP1 permit parking area has been undertaken which has identified similar issues





with parking on Church Avenue which has met the council's criteria for the introduction of a permit parking scheme with significant evidenced support from residents.

Displaced parking has to be factored into any proposal for a residential permit parking zone and in order to mitigate displaced parking an area of Fishwick Parade and Beaconsfield Avenue has been included in the proposal.

- **Church Avenue**

Two objections were received from local businesses on the grounds that the proposal to introduce double yellow lines on the most northern part of Church Avenue would have a detrimental effect on business.

One objector suggested that either the properties on New Hall Lane are provided with the option to purchase DP1 parking permits or alternatively, instead of the no waiting at any time, a mixed permit/2 hour limited waiting bay, the same as is being introduced for the front of Ribble View nursery, be introduced.

Another objector states that the no waiting and the permit holders only parking at the North End of New Hall Lane contradicts a recently granted planning application, risks highly dangerous parking for deliveries and clients bringing sick animals to the local vets on New Hall Lane, and risks the loss of employment for several staff, as well as the loss of a highly prized community service to the local community.

The objector believes that the scheme has been poorly considered without consideration to the local businesses and community.

### **Officers Comments**

Having considered the consultation responses, a modification to the consulted proposals was carried out between 30 June 2023 and 28 July 2023 to remove the proposed Prohibition of Waiting on the northern end of Church Avenue resulting in the area reverting back to unrestricted parking allowing parking for visitors to the businesses located on New Hall Lane at the junction with Church Avenue.

- **Devonshire Place**

One Objection was received from the local garage on Devonshire Place on the grounds that the restrictions planned for Devonshire Place will have a detrimental impact on the businesses as follows:

1. All but three staff working at the four businesses on Devonshire Road travel to work by car and this will impact where they can park if the permit scheme limits one parking permit per business.
2. The proposals will have a financial impact on the businesses if customers are unable to park their car on the street even temporarily. Also, some customers may leave their vehicles on other residential streets because of the waiting time restrictions.
3. Implementing the suggested parking restrictions will render the units worthless and could result in the loss of tenant.



In addition, the objector appeals for allowing daytime business parking on Devonshire Place ONLY during working hours for staff by issuing permits and an extension to the waiting time of the temporary waiting bay at the top of Devonshire Place to allow customer vehicles to be parked and collected on the same day.

### **Officers Comments**

Due to parking problems at the location associated with local businesses a review of the DP1 permit parking area has been undertaken. The proposals acknowledge that the local businesses may require an area of unrestricted carriageway and therefore no restrictions have been proposed to the frontage of the businesses on Devonshire Place.

Records indicate, without prejudice, that there is an area to the rear of two of the businesses on Devonshire Place which may also be used for off road parking facilities.

The objectors' comments regarding the Limited Waiting Bay located at the top of Devonshire Place have been noted, however the proposals include the removal of this bay to preserve the natural flow of traffic and prevent obstruction issues at the northern end of the carriageway.

### **Correspondence of Support**

One expression of support was received from the local councillor responding to one of the objectors on the grounds that they have campaigned for the scheme on behalf of the local residents for over 10 years to stop the garages monopolising the area with vehicles.

The correspondence states that if the scheme is altered, they believe it will need to be for short term parking for visitors to the businesses as this will achieve the aim of the scheme stopping vehicles from the garages being parked all over the area for months at a time.

### **Objections in Response to Modified Proposals**

Further correspondence was received in relation to the modified proposals within the DP1 Permit area on the grounds that there are now only 2 businesses in Devonshire Place and that the volume of traffic and parked cars has reduced significantly resulting in the overflow onto Church Avenue being removed. The objector also requested confirmation of why changes were not being considered in light of their suggestions.

### **Officers Comments**

Consideration was given to the operation of businesses on Devonshire Place and the available parking in the area resulting in parking restrictions not being proposed on the southern end of the carriageway in the vicinity of the businesses.

The Lancashire County Council Resident Parking Scheme Policy has been introduced to provide a consistent and considered approach to requests for new



schemes with officers acknowledging the significant consensus of opinion in the area from local residents regarding parking issues.

The objectors' comments regarding the reduction in traffic and overflow parking on Church Avenue have been noted. However, this proposal is in response to persistent and consistent historical parking issues and requests from residents and other representatives.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the revised measures are implemented.

#### **HR1 Permit Zone**

#### **Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-HR1 and No.22-23(1)/RPH-HR1(S)**

#### **Appendix 'J'**

Four pieces of correspondence were received from local residents and the county councillor for the area on the grounds that the proposals do not go far enough.

- **Hartington Road Support with Comments**

One correspondence of support for the conversion of a number of Limited Waiting Bays on Christ Church Street and Hartington Road to HR1 Permit Holder Only Bays was received from a local resident. However, it states that it is very difficult to find a parking space in the first block of properties near the junction with Fishergate Hill, especially in the evening when residents have returned from work and other commitments.

The correspondent acknowledges that there are available Limited Waiting Bays opposite these properties which are often free. However, they are only a viable option when it is guaranteed that residents will be leaving the house and using their cars before 10am. Therefore, they believe that it is unfair and inconvenient for residents, especially if working night shifts and only returning home around 2-3am, at which point they have to park in other unrestricted roads in the area to avoid disruption of sleep.

In addition, the objector states that the lack of spaces has also impacted on hosting visitors on the grounds that although they have visitor permits, when there is a lack of space it has meant that they have had to park further down the road if they intend to stay for more than 2 hours. In addition, any visitors with mobility issues have no alternative feasible option other than to park in the 2-hour bays which results in actively considering the 2-hour limit, which they believe is not fair to themselves or their visitors.

To alleviate some of the situations that residents are experiencing, the correspondent suggests consideration is given to changing the current Limited Waiting Bays to allow for a 2-hour provision for anyone with unlimited parking for HR1 Permit holders.



- **Osborne Street Additional Correspondence**

Three additional pieces of correspondence were received from residents of Osborne Street submitting a petition with 16 signatures requesting the implementation of a residents only parking scheme on the current unrestricted on-street parking on Osborne Street.

The correspondents state that at present the residents of Osborne Street are continually inconvenienced by the very limited on-road parking available due to non-residents using the unrestricted parking within the area.

### **Officers Comments**

As part of the review proposal for the Hartington Road / Christ Church Street / Spring Bank area, alterations have been made to include further space on the carriageway for permit parking in an aim to alleviate any displaced parking which may have been taking place.

Officers confirm that following the cabinet decision regarding the Preston Permit Review proposals specific evidenced initial survey which will be required for the Bow Lane to Hartington Road area, including Osbourne Street and any further possible amendments to Hartington Road, will be sent out to start the informal consultation process with regards to potential Permit Holder parking schemes.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

### **ML2 Permit Zone**

#### **Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-ML2**

#### **Appendix 'K'**

Two objections were received in relation to the proposed changes around the ML2 permit parking area as detailed below:

- **St Peter's Street**

Two objections were received regarding changes being made to the parking on St Peter's Street.

- The first objection was received from a group of shops located on Adelphi Street on the grounds that they currently have business parking permits for the ML2 Permit Zone and it is already difficult to find parking in the area.

The objector suggests that it would be a better idea to leave St Peter's Street with the current restriction and change Harrington Street to the 2 hour no return as it would be more convenient to their businesses that are based closer to St Peter's Street.

- The second objection was received from a local business on St Peter's Street on the grounds that they are a permit holder and believe changing the parking



situation would remove their ability to park should they need to move their vehicle during the day and would make the street into a parking "free for all".

- The objector states that vehicles are already parked within the restricted zones whether they are a permit holder or not and believes that removing the permit only bays would make this much worse and remove any form of priority from residents who have paid for permits and need priority parking.

### **Officers Comments**

The comments received regarding the parking difficulties on St Peter's Street have been noted, however the current mix of ML2 Permit Holders Only OR Limited Waiting 2 Hours No Return within 2 Hours is not proposed to be amended.

The proposal is to amend the Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm element of the restriction to Monday to Sunday 24 hours. This amendment will still allow Permit Holders unlimited parking in the bay and allow 2-hour parking to be used by people visiting local residents or businesses in the area, and also allows for loading/unloading activities to take place.

The change from Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm (as it currently is) to include Sundays and evenings will require students, commuters and city centre workers to locate alternative parking in the city centre thereby keeping the spaces available for visitors to the local businesses and residents and also benefit Blue badge holders who can continue to park without time limit.

Following confirmation of the above to the respondents 1 objection has subsequently been withdrawn.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

#### **QR1 Permit Zone Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-QR1B Appendix 'L'**

Two objections were received to the proposals highlighted in Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-QR1B as detailed below:

- **Linton Street**

Two objections were received regarding changes being made to the parking on Linton Street:

- The first objection was received from a resident of Plungington Road stating that there has never been an issue in terms of traffic problems or accidents and that cars and larger vehicles are able to get up and down Linton Street with no problems.



The objector states that vehicles coming off Plungington Road are able to make the turn with cars parked on both sides providing cars are parked properly i.e., partially on the kerb and believes that this demonstrates that the current situation does not pose a traffic problem.

The objector confirms that local businesses currently park on Linton Steet for the vast majority of the day and whilst they understand that businesses and residents need to be considerate of one another it does however limit parking. Therefore, believes that by taking away spaces makes even less parking for everyone involved.

- The second objection was received from a resident of Linton Street on the grounds that they believe resident only parking is required as at present the street is regularly filled with cars of both staff and patients of Linton Dental Practice making it impossible for them to park outside their home.

The objector believes that by lifting all the restrictions the parking situation will get worse rather than better.

### **Officers Comments**

At present Linton Street is subject to a Prohibition of Waiting (double yellow line) restriction which has previously allowed residents to park with the issue of a free permit the same as if the area was dedicated as a resident permit scheme.

Following a Traffic Penalty Tribunal ruling it was determined that controlling resident parking by a permit scheme was not permitted with the Prohibition of Waiting restriction. In light of the adjudication an informal consultation was undertaken requesting opinion on the formalisation of the residents permit parking scheme to comply with the legal regulations for introducing permit schemes or removal of the restriction to allow for unrestricted parking with reduced Prohibition of Waiting restrictions in areas where road safety may be compromised, which no consensus was provided.

As there are no road safety issues recorded outside the residential properties on Linton Street officers propose the removal of the Prohibition of Waiting restriction outside the residential properties to allow unrestricted parking whilst maintaining the restrictions at the junction as protection for sightlines to access and egress for the Dental Surgery on Linton Street and also for sightlines onto Plungington Road which is a major bus route. There are no other traffic safety issues recorded on Linton Street.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

**SA1 Permit Zone**  
**Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-SA1**  
**Appendix 'M'**



- **Clarendon Street**

One objection was received to the proposals relating to Clarendon Street on the grounds that any 'resident only parking' on Clarendon Street should be removed as they have monitored the use over the last twelve months and only one vehicle parks there with three spaces available all of the time.

The objector also states that they believe any increase to resident parking pushes challenges to other areas specifically in a city centre where there is no need for car ownership which should not be encouraged.

### **Officers Comments**

Following receipt of multiple concerns from the MP and divisional county councillor on behalf of residents requesting increased permit spaces a full review was undertaken.

Following this review, it is proposed to convert the Limited Waiting on Charlotte Street to mixed Limited Waiting and Permit Holder Parking overall resulting in a further 7 available Permit spaces. These proposals do not remove any of the current free limited waiting spaces available on Charlotte Street and therefore no displacement is envisaged, with regard to parking.

The comments regarding the use of the current bays on Clarendon Street and city centre parking are acknowledged. However, a balance of bays needs to be maintained to meet the conflicting needs of all road users.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

### **SP1 Permit Zone**

**Drawing No. 22-23(1)/RPH-SP1N , Drawing No. 22-23(1)/RPH-SEP1N(S), No 22-23(1)/RPH-SP1S and No. 22-23(1)/RPH-SP1S(S)**

**Appendices 'N1' and 'N2'**

Four pieces of correspondence including a 23-signature petition were received to the proposals relating to the SP1 Permit Zone as follows:

- **St Barnabas' Place – Drawing No. 22-23(1)/RPH-SP1N**

One objection was received in relation to the changes in St Barnabas' Place on the grounds that the proposals will not change anything in the area.

The objector stated that they already have dozens of cars coming from everywhere parking in the Permit Holder Only, on the double yellow lines and even on the footways that you can't get past making it impossible to park in front of their property and believes that the area never seems to get any enforcement.



- **St Paul's Square – Drawing No. 22-23(1)/RPH-SP1S**

One objection was received in relation to the changes in St Paul's Square on the grounds that the proposed changes will reduce the visits they make to Preston as they utilise these bays when nipping into the city centre, particularly the barbers on the Bus Station or some of the independent small businesses at Preston Market.

The objector states that the current 1-hour limited waiting bay is always available for use and they have never witnessed them being misused, therefore they believe that the 1-hour short stay bay should remain as part of an important mix of parking options as paid for parking alternatives are expensive.

- **East Street – Drawing No. 22-23(1)/RPH-SP1S**

One objection was received in relation to the Limited Waiting Bay located at the top of East View with the junction with Meadow Street on the grounds that the proposals do not go far enough. The objector believes that consideration should be given to change the current 2 hour limited waiting bay at the top of East View to Permit Holders Only as the residents genuinely find it extremely difficult to find parking either on the same street or nearby.

The objection also stated that, if the intention was to keep this area as limited waiting for visitors, then they believe that there is currently sufficient space on Meadow Street and in the Deepdale Pavilion for shoppers to use. However, the residents are struggling to find parking in the Permit Holders' spaces as its very limited.

- **East View Petition – 22-23(1)/RPH-SP1S and 22-23(1)/RPH-SP1S(S)**

A petition with 23 signatures was received from residents of East View on the grounds that the proposals do not take into account specific issues being experienced by residents in the area.

The objection states that previously as part of Preston City Council's St Paul's Housing Action Area, work had previously started on resurfacing the roads and providing parking bays in the area. It was completed in and around St Paul's Square and East Street and was planned to finish in East View, however, was stopped at that point and East View didn't get completed. The plans included resurfacing the road and parking bays being introduced on both sides of East View with landscaping.

The objectors confirm that they have been requesting a review for a long time as the area has changed significantly since the current parking bays were initially introduced, stating that they are grateful for this opportunity. The objectors also believe that this is a chance to get things right for the residents and request that a site visit to meet the residents is needed in order to better understand the area and the residents' views before any proposals are made in the area.

The main issues highlighted within the petition are as follows:

- There has been a number of businesses in the area shut down in recent years and are now private residences.





- The restaurant at 18 East View has closed down and has since had a planning application to build 13 flats accepted by Preston City Council but only has 4 spaces on its car park which is likely to increase the problem of parking on East View as it will significantly increase the number of cars on the street while keeping the amount of parking bays the same.
- There are taxi bays situated from 39-43 Meadow Street which were introduced many years ago when the pub culture was thriving on Meadow Street that have recently been freshly painted. However, the pubs have now closed down and the taxi drivers are no longer using these bays.
- There are parking bays for SP1 Permit holders on St Paul's Square in a place where there are few residential houses around and the bays are hardly ever used and are often empty. Suggests that these could be removed and instead add more parking bays in areas where they are actually needed such as in and around East View and Stanleyfield Road.

The petition confirms that the residents of East View have come together to discuss and create a list of proposed changes in the area that they feel would help address the parking problems that they are being faced with as detailed below:

- Request to convert the current 2-hour Limited Waiting bay outside numbers 30-32 to SP1 permit holders only.
- Request to remove the double yellow lines outside 33-34 East View to allow extra parking bays similar to St. Ignatius Square where the bay is marked to the top of the road.
- Request to place a 'Permit holders only past this point' sign at the entrance to East View on the Meadow Street side similar to the AV3 Zone.
- Request to remove the double yellow lines opposite 28-30, 18 and 15-17 East View.
- Request to introduce permit parking or limited time for non-permit holders outside 101 to past 119 Meadow Street where it is currently 1-hour parking. They believe that the bays were originally introduced for shoppers of Meadow Street, but there is already a car park on Schleswig Street and Home Bargains have their own car park. The state that residents of East View and Stanleyfield Road were parking on Meadow Street from no.115 onwards due to not having enough space in East View, but enforcement has now begun on the street which has made the parking problems worse.
- Confirms that St Paul's surgery on 36-38 East Street has now closed and up for sale (could be developed into flats) and the pub opposite (Stephensons Arms) was sold and converted to flats recently. They request a change to 3 parking bays for Doctor permit holder only to SP1 permit parking to provide spaces for nearby residents.



The petition states that the community has a rich history with residents living in this area for over 45 years, giving them an in-depth knowledge of the area. As a result, they believe they have a deep understanding of the changes in the area and the challenges faced, including the issue of parking. Therefore, would be grateful if a representative from Lancashire County Council could speak to the residents as it would help them understand the area and the specific issues that they face and work together to improve parking for its residents.

### **Officers Comments**

Having considered the consultation responses, a modification to the consulted proposals was carried out between 30 June 2023 and 28 July 2023 to defer the introduction of the consulted proposals within the SP1 Permit Zone to allow for a further review of the area with the intention of mitigating the concerns raised.

The deferral of the SP1 proposals will remove any proposed changes to the restrictions on site with the exception of the revocation of the Doctors Bays which are no longer required due to the closure of the Doctors practice on East Street, whilst still defining exact residential address points with regards to the eligibility for permits in the aim to address the increasing pressure on available permit spaces and avoid resident permit scheme from being further overwhelmed.

No further responses were received in relation to the modified proposals.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposals within the SP1 Permit Zone be withdrawn from these Orders to allow a further review by the resident permit engineer prior to the introduction of any new proposals.

### **St Mark's Zone - old SM1 Permit Zone**

#### **Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-SM1(A) and Drawing No.22-23(1)/RPH-SM1(B) Appendices 'O1' and 'O2'**

- **Ingot Street – Drawing No. 22-23(1)/RPH-SM1(B)**

Three objections were received from local residents and businesses in the area on the grounds that the proposal does not allow for parking on Ingot Street.

The points raised by the objectors are as follows:

- That parking is required on Ingot Street in close proximity to their properties.
- That the vehicles currently parking on Ingot Street do not cause an obstruction.
- That there is nowhere else locally to park.
- That if the proposal goes ahead, they would need to park in the bays on Brieryfield Road which is not viable as they require parking on Ingot Street to allow for unloading shopping and access to off road parking.



## **Officers Comments**

The objector's comments with regard to Ingot Street are noted. However, these restrictions are being proposed in relation to issues with obstructive parking resulting in road safety issues.

The carriageway on Ingot Street is approximately 4m wide and in order to maintain the natural flow of traffic and ensure a swept path for larger vehicles at the eastern and western end a No Waiting at Any Time restriction is being proposed. The width of the available carriageway should in principle also provide a 3.5m running lane for emergency vehicles should be maintained as far as possible.

Parked vehicles could force pedestrians and other footway users to walk on or use the carriageway surface which would not be suitable for mobility or visually impaired users and we are unable to condone footway parking.

The proposed restrictions allow for loading and unloading activities to take place and will assist in keeping the area clear of parked vehicles further assisting access to private access to off road parking.

## **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

- **St Mark's Road Area – Drawing No. 22-23(1)/RPH-SM1(A)**

Twenty-one objections have been received in response to the proposals within the St Mark's Road/Wellington Street Area. The main points are as follows:

- That there does not seem to be any problems arising from the current parking arrangements in the area and that all home owners should get the option to park their vehicles in front of their properties.
- That the area is not so central that there is an issue and the street is never full. However, the proposals will reduce the number of parking spaces available for residents which will lead to an impossible situation.
- That resident parking is already difficult enough and believes that by imposing yellow lines in and around the area will simply flood other streets with vehicles that cannot be parked outside individual homes.
- That vehicles parked, typically, on the railway side of St Mark's Road currently act as a traffic calming measure as vehicles have to slow down to allow for oncoming traffic, and that restricting parking in this area will increase the speed of vehicles travelling on the road.
- That rather than have nowhere to park their vehicles would prefer to pay for parking.

## **Officers Comments**

Having considered the consultation responses, a modification to the consulted proposals was carried out between 30 June 2023 and 28 July 2023 to remove



sections of restrictions within the St Mark's Road area to allow for unrestricted parking following concerns raised in response to the formal consultation.

The modification will allow for additional unrestricted parking for the residents and visitors to the area, whilst maintaining the current 1 Hour Limited Waiting Bays along with reduced Prohibition of Waiting restrictions in areas that road safety may be compromised.

No further responses were received in relation to the modified proposals.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the revised measures are implemented.

### **Pay and Display Parking – Appendix 'P1' and 'P2'**

Twenty-six responses were received to the proposals relating the increase in Pay and Display parking provisions, along with the increase in Pay and Display Tariffs and introduction of Sunday Pay and Display parking.

- **Additional Pay and Display Parking**

One piece of correspondence on behalf of the local residents was received in relation to the proposed location of the additional Pay and Display parking bay on Guildhall Street.

The correspondent confirmed that they are currently experiencing difficulties gaining access/egress from off-street parking facilities and raise concerns that the location of the proposed bay will not provide sufficient manoeuvring space from vehicles.

### **Officers Comments**

Following feedback relating to access/egress to private off-street parking areas a swept path analysis was undertaken to determine the extents require to allow sufficient manoeuvring space for vehicles to gain access to and from the parking area and protecting sufficient sightlines.

Having considered the feedback and the result of the swept path analysis, a modification to the consulted proposals was carried out between 30 June 2023 and 28 July 2023.

The modified proposals reduce the proposed Pay and Display parking bay and provide additional No Waiting at Any Time and No Loading/Unloading at Any Time provisions to allow for sufficient manoeuvring space for vehicles and adequate carriageway width for larger vehicles to pass along with protecting sightlines.

No further responses were received in relation to the modified proposals.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the revised measures are implemented.



- **Pay and Display Tariff Increase**

Five Objections were received in relation to the Pay and Display Tariffs on the grounds that although they understand the need for increased revenue generation by Lancashire County Council to meet its obligations to the people of Preston, the council must be mindful of the need to implement changes in a way that protects and guarantees increased business, leisure and religious activity around the Preston City Centre.

The objectors state that the City Centre is already struggling with banks closing, cost of business rates, with many vacant shops and car parking charges which already put people off. Therefore, they believe that the parking charges should be reduced and not increased.

The objections also include the suggestion of having specific times when parking in the areas is free to encourage more people to visit the city centre and boost commerce. These times with the grounds are as follows:

- a. Weekdays 6 am to 8 am and after 6 pm to allow those who need to get something from the city centre shops sufficient time to do so before or after work.
- b. On Friday's free parking during the Muslim prayer time (beginning 30 minutes before and ending 30 minutes after the prayer time).
- c. Saturdays 6 am to 8 am and after 6 pm as some people only come to the city centre on Saturday and most shops open at or after 8 am and close at 6pm.
- d. Sundays 9 am - 2 pm to give people the sufficient time to practice their religion at the number of churches and religious centres around the city centre.

One objector states that they are aware of the aim for people to use different transportation or use car parks however believes that although some may, it will put other people off at a time when the town centre needs as many visitors as possible.

The objector suggests that parking is made free on Lancashire County Council controlled car parks on a Saturday and Sunday, believing that people will use these car parks and achieve the council's aims whilst helping out the businesses in the city centre.

### **Officers Comments**

On-street parking provision near to the city centre is located in a more desirable location than off-street car parks. This makes parking on-street much more attractive to visitors, especially those that are not familiar with the area and rely on satellite navigation to direct them to a city/town centre rather than a specific car park.

Providing short stay 'Pay and Display' parking within the city centre taking into account the increased demand for parking in the city centre from visitors to the city



will generate a higher turnover of cars giving all residents and visitors better access to local businesses.

Due to the demand for on-street parking, most city and town centres have restrictions for length of stay, i.e., maximum stays of one or two hours with a no-return period.

Parking on-street in the core area can be considered premium parking, meaning the tariff should be higher than off-street car parks. The aim being to encourage parking in off-street car parks wherever possible.

The majority of visitors will not object to paying a charge to pay for a premium location. For those that do not wish to pay as much for parking or wish to park for longer periods, 'Long Stay' parking is also available in the car parks on the perimeter of AV1, AV3 and FS1 Permit Zones.

The comments regarding free parking on Lancashire County Council controlled car parks on a Saturday and Sunday is acknowledged. However, the county council is only responsible for the Bus Station Multi-Storey Car Park and the small car parks off Bow Lane and have no control over the city council or privately run car parks.

The introduction of car park charges on the county council's specified car parks are required to contribute to the maintenance of the facilities whilst promoting the correct use of the available spaces.

### **Recommendation**

Officers recommend the revised measures are implemented.

- **Introduction of Sunday Pay and Display Parking**

Twenty Objections were received to the proposals relating to the introduction of Pay and Display on a Sunday. The main points are that the introduction of Sunday Charges will have a negative effect on those attending St Wilfrid's Church and seriously impact visitor numbers and discourage people from travelling into the city centre, hitting businesses at a time when they are already struggling.

Points raised within the objections are as follows:

1. That the proposals will have a significant effect on the life and viability of the parish and may also impact their ability to minister to the homeless and needy in this area of Preston.
2. That St Wilfrid's Mass attendance on a Sunday is reliant on people being able to freely park around the Square and nearby Cross Street during services. Particularly as many Sunday bus services don't start early enough for people to get in the bus station then to get a second bus down Fishergate.
3. That Sunday is the 'Sabbath' day for Catholics/Christians who take their families to Mass and the one day that people do not want to be worrying over money for parking meters.
4. That the introduction of Sunday Charges will affect access to St Wilfrid's RC Church on Chapel Street, for Sunday services especially the 10:15am Sunday Family Mass for parishioners of all ages and range of mobility; and the



4:30pm Sunday Mass attended in the main by many young people of limited (or none) income.

5. That extending metered parking to Sunday will be a deterrent to people attending the church, especially the poor members and the elderly, who are particularly dependent on being able to park near the church resulting in people looking to attend mass elsewhere where they can park for free.
6. That restricting parking to one hour is not sufficient for people to be able to attend Sunday Mass, let alone events immediately afterwards.
7. That the proposals will result in many people moving to other churches where they can park more easily and without charge resulting in St Wilfrid's Church becoming less viable as a church community not only in numbers, but also financially, both of which could affect the work they do with the poor and disadvantaged in the city centre.
8. That if parking charges are introduced on a Sunday this will not only affect St Wilfrid's but also local businesses as they usually go to the shops and businesses in central Preston after attending church on a Sunday.
9. That the introduction of Sunday parking charges will not only make people's lives more expensive it will further damage Preston City Centre.
10. That the introduction of Sunday charges will result in customers choosing to shop elsewhere.
11. That if the parking charges are imposed on a Sunday the number of people will inevitably be significantly reduced at a time when city centre businesses are already struggling, and church attendances are going down. Whilst they appreciate the need to control parking, believe that the unintended consequences of the proposed change would have a significant impact on city centre businesses and churches.

The objections state that the following:

- That encouragement is needed to get people back into the city centres not to discourage them by introducing yet more cost by imposing more metered parking, especially as lots of city centres are struggling at the moment due to the current climate of inflated fuel and food costs along with just getting over Covid and recovering the damage that has been done to our cities.

Rather than encouraging public transport the proposals will merely divert people to out of town shopping centres as the problem isn't that the free parking areas are taking people away from the car parks, it is that the car parks are too expensive so they put people off visiting.

- The objections states that in addition to the Masses on Tuesdays they provide food to those who need it in conjunction with Luv Preston, on Wednesdays they provide clothes and sleeping bags for those in need and the Church Hall provides a home for AA and GA groups, along with space for other agencies to interact with the homeless when needed.  
Parking near to St Wilfrid's Church is difficult and putting charges at the church would potentially reduce the congregation at church and the work it does for Preston and the community.
- That Winckley Square has a rich heritage and 'The Friends of Winckley Square' put on events throughout the year which are mainly on a Sunday,



therefore believes that should free parking not be available, then this could put people off attending these events as this will increase the cost of the event.

- That due to the long-standing historic importance of this Jesuit Church to the community of Preston, and the closure of churches in or close to the town centre, those attending Sunday's Masses travel further than the average attendee at other Roman Catholic churches in Preston. Therefore, believes that the availability of parking without charges is very important.
- That Sunday Mass is an important part of the week socially for many elderly people and often the only opportunity they have for getting out and seeing other people. After Mass they visit the church hall for a cup of tea and a chat, which allows them to connect with others, something we all know is vital for our mental health and wellbeing.
- That free parking at Mass times on a Sunday has always been available and greatly benefits the elderly and less able members of the parish as they are able to access the free parking without having to walk long distances, which the majority are unable to do. The objector believes that many of these people are on a limited income and in a cost-of-living crisis, such as we are experiencing at the moment, any additional expenses are unaffordable and could lead to people deciding that they can no longer afford to go to church. They will then become isolated and lonely.
- That the city centre is already struggling with banks closing, cost of business rates, with many vacant shops and car parking charges which already put people off. Therefore, believes that the parking charges should be reduced and not increased.
- That the proposals will deter visitors and consumers from visiting the city centre and does not think that timing could be worse as major disruption to business continues during the ongoing Ringway and Friargate roadworks. The objector states that it is vital that the county council strives to support the city centre through a difficult transitional period believing that introducing additional costs for visitors is not the way to support the city.

**The objections also make a number of suggestions as detailed below:**

1. That St Wilfrid's does a lot of work within the centre of Preston by actively helping and supporting the wider community and suggests that in order to minimise the financial impact on attendees, consideration is given to the Sunday charging periods in the streets closest to St Wilfrid's Church to be applicable only from 12 noon to 4pm which would mean that those attending the Sunday Masses at 7am and 10.15am would not be liable for parking charges and those attending the 4.30pm Mass, would be outside the timescale for charges.





2. Suggests that either an exemption to the charges is considered for Mass times at St Wilfrid's Church or propose parking charges between 12pm and 4pm on Sundays to allow free parking for Mass at St Wilfrid's Church.
3. Suggests that if residents are to receive parking permits, something similar for the churchgoers, specifically in relation to their attendance at St Wilfrid's, receive something similar with a couple of hours fixed time of stay, which would amply cover for the duration of Mass and allow the short time to proceed to and from the church.
4. Suggests that it would be beneficial to all parishioners especially the elderly if the parking fee implementation was either scrapped or the times were changed to enable free parking until 13:00.
5. Suggests that the council be more generous in allowing for at least three cars with disabled permits to avail the space on the north side of Winckley Square, thereby enabling such occupants (drivers/passengers) to easily access St. Wilfrid's Church on Chapel Street, as well as facilities in Winckley Street.
6. Suggests that the proposals are reconsidered in light of the negative impact on a large number of people for what is likely to be a fairly small increase in revenue.
7. Suggests that at the very least the proposals are postponed until Preston's major landmarks features are open and the extensive roadworks are completed.

## **Officers Comments**

### **"Equality and Cohesion/Equality Impact Assessment"**

The requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty are to ensure that "due regard" is given to its three principles which are to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010; to advance equality of opportunity for groups who share relevant protected characteristics and to foster good relations between groups who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not share them. This includes assessing the potential impact of relevant proposals on groups with protected characteristics which are age (younger or older people), disability, gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership status, pregnancy or maternity, race, religion or belief, sex/gender and sexual orientation.

In relation to the religion or belief protected characteristic a concern has been raised on behalf of people who attend St Wilfrid's Catholic Church as changes to the arrangements for Pay and Display charges being extended to include Sundays between 8am to 6pm will adversely impact those attending Mass on Sundays who could previously park without charge.

An additional concern was raised that the time limits of 30 minutes or one hour's parking would not allow people to park for the duration of Mass. Having considered the consultation responses a modification to the advertised proposals was carried out between 30 June 2023 and 28 July 2023 to include an additional time of 2 hours to the tariff structure which may also benefit those attending the nearby Mosque and facilitate short stay parking provisions for visitors to the city centre whilst not impeding on the long stay parking provisions provided by the city centre car parks.



Whilst it is acknowledged that the introduction of charges will have a detrimental impact for some people who attend St Wilfrid's Church and some local residents who may be within the older people protected characteristics group, it is felt that the overall benefits of the proposal to reduce longer stay parking in the area will be of benefit to a wider range of people including those who have protected characteristics, e.g. Blue Badge holders who are within the disability protected characteristics group.

In relation to the introduction of charges on Sunday and the impact raised by people attending St Wilfrid's Church for Mass on Sunday. The current charging times are 8 am to 6pm. Introducing charges on a Sunday brings the parking offer in line with the rest of the week and maintains the split between on and off-street provision by ensuring that the cost for parking on street exceeds the off-street costs which have been in place for many years.

The effective management of the bays, through charging, allows for the spaces to be available to users at various times throughout the day and reduces the instances where cars belonging to residents, shop workers, longer stay shoppers monopolise the bays.

The change to pay and display from unrestricted (as it currently is on a Sunday) will also benefit Blue badge holders who can continue to park without charge or time limit.

Not all shops are bound by Sunday trading hours, for example the Starbucks on Fishergate opens 9am to 5pm on a Sunday suggesting that there is a "pre shopping" trade that they tap into and is reasonable to assert that other "eateries" provide the same extended hours. It is noted by Preston BID that the pay and display spaces are currently utilised by city centre workers on a Sunday which places them in direct conflict with Church goers and shoppers. The introduction of pay and display will require the workers to locate alternative parking in the city centre thereby keeping the spaces available for visitors to the city centre.

No further responses were received in relation to the modified proposals.

### **Recommendation**

Based on the requirements for access for blue badge holders and the potential impact of the relevant proposals on all groups with protected characteristics, officers recommend the original proposals including the revised measures to include an additional time of 2 hours to the tariff structure are implemented.

### **Summary**

There is nothing in the points of objections which are fatal to the proposals and it is advised that the Orders be made reflecting the proposals as modified as shown on the drafts at Appendices 'A3', 'B3' and 'C3'.

### **Implications:**

This item has the following implications, as indicated:



## Financial

The costs of the Traffic Regulation Orders along with new signs and lines will be funded from the 2023/24 Highways budget at an estimated cost of £85,000.

The cost of the Pay and Display machines will be funded from 2023/24 Highways Budget at an estimated cost of £45,000. The machines will generate a relatively small level of income (that can only be estimated at this stage) that will initially offset the costs of the machines, and in future years help the service achieve existing income targets.

## Risk management

Failure to implement these measure may result in:

- Pressure on available permit spaces resulting in the resident permit schemes being further overwhelmed.
- Pressure on providing short stay parking provisions for visitors to the city centre and a sufficient time period for people to practice their religion at the number of places of worship around the city centre.

Road safety may also be compromised should the proposed restrictions not be approved.

## List of Background Papers

Paper	Date	Contact/Tel
None		
Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate		
N/A		

