

## **PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**

### **AGENDA**

**Meeting to be held in COMMITTEE ROOM 2, CIVIC CENTRE on  
Wednesday, 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2018 at 5.30 p.m.**

ITEM		PAGE
1.	<b>Receipt of Declarations of Interest (if any)</b>	
2.	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	
3.	<b>Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2018</b>  (copy attached)	1
4.	<b>Report of the meeting of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 2018</b>  (copy attached)	4
5.	<b>Report of the meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2018</b>  (copy attached)	6

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 6. | <b>Report of the meeting of the Development Control<br/>(Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee<br/>held on 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 2018</b> | 8 |
|----|--|---|

(copy attached)

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 7. | <b>Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS)<br/>Delivery Procedure</b> | 13 |
|----|--|----|

Report of the Executive Director of Economy and Place

(copy attached)

Elaine Waugh,  
Head of Law and Governance,  
Civic Centre  
SUNDERLAND

30<sup>th</sup> October, 2018

## Item 3

**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in COMMITTEE ROOM 2 on WEDNESDAY, 10<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER, 2018 at 5.30 p.m.**

### **Present:-**

Councillor Jackson in the Chair

Councillors Bell, M. Dixon, English, I. Galbraith, Haswell, Hodson, Lauchlan, Mordey, Porthouse, Rowntree, Williams and Watson

### **Declarations of Interest**

The City of Sunderland Tree Preservation (No. 172) Order 2018 at Land Between 20 Woodside Grove and 1 Cranborne, East Herrington, Sunderland

Councillor English made an open declaration as a Member of the Gentoo Board and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Hodson made an open declaration that family members lived in this street but that he still retained an open mind on the Order.

Councillor Porthouse made an open declaration that he had helped facilitate a meeting between residents and Gentoo and at no time had he tried to influence the Tree Preservation Order and still retained an open mind on the Order.

### **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Chequer, Essl, Farthing, Francis, Johnston, Mullen, Scaplehorn, Scullion, P. Smith, P. Walker and D. Wilson.

### **Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 19<sup>th</sup> June, 2018**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> June, 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Report of the meetings of the Development Control (North Sunderland)  
Sub Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> June, 3<sup>rd</sup> July and 7<sup>th</sup> August, 2018**

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> June, 3<sup>rd</sup> July and 7<sup>th</sup> August, 2018 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

2. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

**Report of the meetings of the Development Control (South Sunderland)  
Sub Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> June, 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 6<sup>th</sup> August and 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 2018**

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> June, 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 6<sup>th</sup> August and 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 2018 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

**Report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> June, 3<sup>rd</sup> July, 7<sup>th</sup> August and 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018**

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> June, 3<sup>rd</sup> July, 7<sup>th</sup> August and 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

**The City of Sunderland Tree Preservation (No. 172) Order 2018 at Land  
Between 20 Woodside Grove and 1 Cranborne, East Herrington,  
Sunderland**

The Executive Director of Economy and Place (amended) submitted a report (copy circulated) which advised the Committee with regards to two objections that had been received in response to the making of a Provisional Tree Preservation Order in respect of trees at the site between Woodside Grove and Cranborne, East Herrington and to ask that the Committee consider both the objections received and the contents of the report, and indicate its support (or otherwise) to the view of the Executive Director of Economy and Place that

Tree Preservation (No. 172) Order, 2018 at land between 20 Woodside Grove and 1 Cranborne, East Herrington, Sunderland, be confirmed, without modifications.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Andrew Browning, Principal Planning Officer presented the report and advised Members of an amendment within the report, and it should read, Report of the Executive Director of Economy and Place and not The Chief Executive.

Councillor Hodson requested clarification with regards to the claim that this was an instrument to prevent development on the land and commented that this would only be a material concern as a potential developer could still rearrange the plots to accommodate the trees on the site.

Mr Browning advised that this was correct and Officers would have to be confident that any proposal would not be harmful to the trees but also it was still possible for the developer to propose the trees be removed and it would be a question of value for the development and if this outweighed the value of the trees so Officers would have to consider the circumstances of each individual case when determining a recommendation for Members.

Councillor Haswell raised a number of queries in relation to the quality of the trees and how they had scored. Mr Browning provided the detailed scores and advised that these had been completed via an independent arboricultural officer.

Full consideration having been given to the item, it was:-

5. RESOLVED that the Committee considered the contents of this report and the objections received and indicated its support to the view of the Executive Director of Economy and Place that Tree Preservation (no.172) Order, 2018 at Land Between 20 Woodside Grove and 1 Cranborne East Herrington, Sunderland, be confirmed without modification.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) J. JACKSON  
(Chairman)

# Item 4

**At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (NORTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY 2nd OCTOBER, 2018 at 3.45 p.m.**

## **Present:-**

Councillor Jackson in the Chair

Councillors Essl, Francis, Porthouse, and Scullion.

## **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

## **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Chequer, Hodson, Scaplehorn and D. Wilson.

## **Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder**

The Executive Director of Economy and Place submitted a report and a circulatory report (copies circulated) relating to the North Sunderland area, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council upon applications made thereunder.

(for copy reports – see original minutes)

## **18/01347/LP3 – Temporary change of use of Roker Cliff Park and erection of temporary buildings and structures, to allow for Sunderland Illuminations and Festival of Light to operate for a number of days annually between 1<sup>st</sup> October – 30<sup>th</sup> November for a 5 year period – Roker Cliff Park, Cliffe Park, Sunderland**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

The representative also advised of a late submission objecting to the proposals and the officers response was provided in the late sheets provided (copies circulated).

1. RESOLVED that Members grant consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992 (as amended), subject to the five conditions set out in the main report and

the amended condition (no 2) and additional condition (no 6) detailed in the late sheets circulated at the meeting.

**18/01347/LP3 – Temporary change of use of Roker Cliff Park and erection of temporary buildings and structures, to allow for Sunderland Illuminations and Festival of Light to operate for a number of days annually between 1<sup>st</sup> October-30<sup>th</sup> November for a 5 year period – Roker Cliff Park, Cliff Park, Sunderland**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

The representative advised that the late submission objecting to the proposals and the officers response was once again provided in the late sheets provided (copies circulated).

2. RESOLVED that consent be granted under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992 (as amended), subject to the five conditions set out in the main report and the additional condition (no. 6) as detailed in the late sheets circulated at the meeting

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) J. JACKSON,  
Chairman

## Item 5

**At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND)  
SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on MONDAY, 1<sup>st</sup> OCTOBER, 2018  
at 4.00 p.m.**

### **Present:-**

Councillor Essl in the Chair

Councillors Bell, M. Dixon, English, Jackson, Mordey, Porthouse, Scullion, Waller and Watson

### **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors D. Dixon, Galbraith, Hodson, Mullen, Scaplehorn, P. Smith and A. Wilson.

### **Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder**

The Executive Director of Economy and Place submitted a report (copy circulated) relating to the South Sunderland area, copies of which had been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

**18/00531/FUL – Change of use from night club (sui generis) to House of Multi Occupation (sui generis) with associated elevational alterations, including replacement UPVC windows, dormer windows to north elevation, rendering and alterations to existing entrance.  
255-256 High Street West, Sunderland, SR1 3DH**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the development proposal to Members of the Sub Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

Councillor English commented that on the circulated plans the bedrooms seemed to be quite small; the representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that the smallest room was 10square metres which was similar to the room



sizes for the previously approved proposal for the property; there was no adopted standard for room sizes in the city however the rooms did meet the standards set out in the interim student accommodation policy.

Councillor M. Dixon welcomed the application and stated that students living in the city centre would help to support businesses within the city centre.

Councillor Porthouse commented that it was good to see that the property would be brought back into use however he was concerned that the property could be used as a hostel; the representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that the property had previously been awarded planning permission for 9 residential units however there had not been the demand for the accommodation; this new proposal was aimed at the student market and as student accommodation was a sui generis use then any change of use to a non-student use would require change of use consent.

Members having discussed the matter it was:-

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the satisfactory resolution of the outstanding land contamination matter for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the 4 conditions set out therein.

### **Items for Information**

Having noted that the previously arranged visit for 16/17 The Cedars had been unable to be held it was:-

2. RESOLVED that a site visit be undertaken in respect of 17/00581/VAR – Land Rear of 16 and 17 The Cedars, Ashbrooke, Sunderland

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) M. ESSL,  
Chairman.

## Item 6

**At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (HETTON, HOUGHTON AND WASHINGTON) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 2<sup>nd</sup> OCTOBER, 2018 at 5.45 p.m.**

### **Present:-**

Councillor Scullion in the Chair

Councillors Blackett, M. Dixon, Essl, Hodson, Jackson, Lauchlan, Porthouse, Rowntree and P. Walker

### **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

### **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were given on behalf of Councillors Scaplehorn and Williams

### **Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder**

The Executive Director of Economy and Place submitted a report and late sheets (copies circulated), which related to Hetton, Houghton and Washington areas, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

### **18/00705/MAW – Relocation of pre-cast concrete wall, extension of concrete hardstanding area and installation of picking station with associated conveyors and weigh bridge at Timberpack Waste Recycling Centre, Staithes Road, Washington, NE38 8NW**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place informed Members that representations had been received from Councillors Taylor and F. Miller and advised that a late sheet had been circulated outlining the objections and a response from Officers in Environmental Health addressing their concerns. The Chairman adjourned the meeting for five minutes to allow Members time to consider the late sheet as circulated.

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place presented the application advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application in relation to the principle of the development, residential and visual amenity, highways matters, drainage and flooding and ecology.

Councillor Hodson referred to additional condition two contained within the late sheet and asked why the operator would only be asked to submit a further noise assessment following any complaints from received within six months after installation and was informed by the Officer that Environmental Health Officers were confident; having consulted data received from the noise assessment and that which the department already has; that the application would not give rise to any increase in noise or subsequent complaints from its approval.

Councillor Hodson went on to ask for clarification as to what would be regarded as a substantiated complaint and was advised that it would have to be a complaint which could be investigated by Environmental Health and then subject to the findings identifying that the application site was the source of the noise being complained about.

In response to a question from Councillor Lauchlan regarding the findings of the noise assessment being before the installation of the new machinery, the Officer advised that the applicants had taken readings from other operational sites in the country where the machinery was currently used to produce their report. Councillor Lauchlan thanked the Officer for the information and commented that it would have been beneficial if that information had been set out within the report.

The Chairman then welcomed Councillor Taylor to the Committee who had requested to speak in objection to the application.

Councillor Taylor thanked Members for the opportunity to address them and advised that he spoke in objection to the application on behalf of his ward constituents who lived in the vicinity of the recycling centre. He informed Members that in addition to the representations as set out in the late sheet there had historically been a number of complaints regarding noise levels in the area from residents.

Councillor Taylor then informed Members that he had been forwarded a copy of the noise assessment undertaken on behalf of the applicant and it identified a number of locations in and around the site where readings had been taken from. The noise assessment listed Barmston Court and Horsley Road as two of the sites where noise sensitive receptors had been used and findings recorded. Councillor Taylor commented that since the production of the noise assessment there had been further housing development in the area and both Hebden Court and Chillingham Close were closer properties to the application site and findings from these locations had not been taken into consideration.

Councillor Taylor commented that he felt that noise assessment findings from the properties in closer proximity to the site should also be taken as these would be those most affected by the development and asked Members to consider deferment of the item until these assessments could be undertaken.

The Chairman invited Councillor F. Miller to address the Committee and she advised that she had visited sites in the past and was aware that previously the Environment Agency had requested that measures be put in place to help address concerns over noise from nearby residents but that there were still issues that needed addressing. In 2013 visits had been made to the site and when asked to switch off particular machinery the offending noises had ceased so it had been obvious where they were emanating from.

The Officer informed the Committee that they must be conscious that any complaints in relation to noise would be perceived to be from the site as it currently was. The application before Members was for a new piece of machinery and therefore could not be the source of the noise that residents were complaining about.

In relation to the location of noise receptors for the noise assessment Officers had advised that background noise had been taken from homes much deeper into the Teal Farm estate and therefore the data collated was from a far wider range than was necessary. The noise assessment showed a map of source points surrounding the site where data was gathered from and all levels had been satisfactory and it was the view of Officers; based on the data received; that the proposal would not have the impact of any increase in noise from the site.

Councillor Porthouse commented that the Committee were only considering the application before them today, and although he was sympathetic with the issues regarding noise from the site, this was outside of the proposed application as it was in relation to the current situation and not the machinery which was not even installed at this time. There were other routes to take to raise those concerns and have them addressed.

Councillor Hodson drew Members attention to the report, commenting that they were being asked not to consider noise from the current site but yet this had been used as the basis to set the hours of operation within the conditions and therefore could not understand how Members could not consider the concerns raised today as being relevant in making their decision.

Members were informed that the proposed application was hoped to bring improvements to the workings of the site and were reminded that this would be no more vehicular movements or tonnage and was to just help better process the current deliveries.

The Chairman welcomed Mr Bennett to the Committee who was in attendance to speak on behalf of the applicant, Timberpack. Mr. Bennett thanked Members for the opportunity to address the Committee and advised that the applicant was very open in listening to concerns from residents and explained that they had many visits to the site in the past.

Mr. Bennett informed Members that the site could be a dangerous and that this application would enable them to keep this piece of machinery segregated from pedestrian movement around the site. He advised the Committee that this machinery would only be used to process contaminated materials, and therefore 90% of materials delivered to them would not require this machinery.

He referred Members to a document he had submitted, which was circulated to Members and explained that following monitoring of this machine at other sites the continuous noise level of the proposed machinery would be approximately 73.9dB(A), with occasional peaks at 78.6dB(A) and that these were similar or lower than the existing noise levels generated on site by vehicular movements.

Members having no further questions and having fully considered the application and representations, it was unanimously:-

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons as set out within the report and late sheet and subject to the ten conditions detailed therein.

**18/01023/FUL – Construction of a 14,585 sq.m (c. 157,000 sq.ft) B2 Manufacturing / B8 Logistics Warehouse, with associated earthworks, landscaping, parking and access proposals at site of former B and Q Warehouse, Armstrong Road, Armstrong Industrial Estate, Washington**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place presented the application advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

The Officer drew Members attention to a typographical error in condition 9 of the main report; advising that where it referred to condition 7 it should in fact be condition 8. Members were also informed that conditions 3 and 4 of the main report were identical and therefore condition 4 should be deleted should Members be minded to approve the report.

Members drew attention to the dB levels within the conditions for this application appearing to be considerably lower than that of the last application and sought clarification as to the reason for this. The Officer commented that Environmental Health would take the lead on providing the relevant noise levels for applications and it was suggested that this area could be considered at one of the future training events for Members so that they could better understand the reasoning behind their decisions.

Members having fully considered the application and having no further questions, it was unanimously:-

2. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons as set out within the report and late sheet and subject to the twelve conditions detailed therein.

### **Items for Information**

Members having fully considered the items for information contained within the matrix, it was:-

3. RESOLVED that the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed)      A. SCULLION,  
Chairman.



**PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE  
WEDNESDAY 7<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2018**

**REPORT TO CONSIDER AND REVIEW:**

**A COMMUNITY PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME  
(CPMS) DELIVERY PROCEDURE**

## **REPORT TO PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS**

### **COMMITTEE NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY**

#### **Purpose of the Report**

This report reviews existing Community Parking Management Schemes (CPMS) and the methods of delivery used for future CPMS. The report then sets out a proposed CPMS investigation procedure and a method to ascertain the level of local public support.

#### **Introduction and background**

The proposed procedures outlined within this report have been developed following implementation of 10 CPMS and CPMS Extensions throughout the City. With the first being the Royal Hospital Phase 1 implemented December 2011 up to Hospital Phase 4 implemented September 2017.

#### **A new way of delivery – University and Millfield Area and Howick Park**

With so many schemes now implemented, areas around existing CPMS are more defined and so less investigation may be required.

#### **Initial request**

Once a parking problem has been highlighted to the council, an officer will investigate whether there is a longstanding issue in the area and various requests for a similar area or links to a Commuter hub e.g. Hospital, Metro Station etc. Usually the Feasibility Team within Highways Asset Management would collate such requests.

#### **Qualifying Criteria (to be considered for the programme or future programmes)**

Upon collation and assessment of reports, requests and complaints the details should be forwarded on to the Infrastructure and Commercial Manager / Team.

The CPMS Team within Infrastructure and Commercial will do further investigations / site visits, make contact with ward members etc and create a short report / brief, in relation to parking in the reported area.

#### **Ranking/Priority of CPMS Requests for Service**

Once a scheme / area have had investigations carried out, the above short report / brief will be discussed with the Portfolio Holder for Environment & Transport.

#### **Progressing a scheme and Community Support**

Once a CPMS is deemed feasible following the above process, it will then go through a process of surveys, working groups and public engagement(s) by way of an informal consultation (letter and vote). Community support is then identified through 2 tests: in



advance of progressing through the Statutory Legal Process.

#### **Existing programme / schemes.**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Zone/Phase</b>	<b>Est completion date</b>
University & Millfield Area	1	April 2019
Howick Park	1	April 2019
Seaburn Metro area (Amendment)	1	August 2019
Ashbrooke Thornholme (Hendon)	2	April 2020

#### **Recommendation**

In summary, this report recommends that this CPMS procedure is taken forward to ensure that resources are targeted at the agreed most necessary areas. Subject to available funding, resources and satisfactory completion of all statutory procedures, it is considered reasonable to begin work on up to 2 new CPMS per year or 1 new CPMS and 1 CPMS extension per year. On this basis, a recommendation is made to take forward / investigate 3 new areas and 3 areas of possible extension areas as an initial programme of CPMS's, these are identified as follows:

<b>NEW CPMS Areas</b>	<b>Zone/Phase</b>
Doxford / East Herrington	1
Sunderland Eye Infirmary	1
Hendon (High Street East)	1

<b>NEW CPMS Extensions</b>	<b>Zone/Phase</b>
Seaburn Metro Phase 2	2
Royal Hospital 5	5
Stadium of Light (Event)	3

## REPORT TO PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

### 1. A NEW WAY OF DELIVERY - THE ROYAL HOSPITAL AREA AND STADIUM OF LIGHT EVENTS SCHEME REVIEW

**Previous methods:** Previous methods were outlined in the Planning and Highways Committee Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> July 2014 Report to consider and review: A Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS) Delivery Procedure (Appendix A).

**A new way of delivery:** As schemes have been implemented different methods have been developed that give more engagement back to the Local Ward Members, Resident Groups and street champions.

We are also discovering that schemes will only gain public support in streets that are clearly affected by parking issues. Parking surveys are used to collect data to determine the kerbside parking levels as a first step.

Using this data a potential CPMS area can then be drawn up. At which stage the initial informal public consultation will be carried out (Public Engagement). This then gives us the basis of an area which has public support or not, the area with public support would go into Round 2 of the Public engagement, which includes a more detailed look at the CPMS zones and restrictions.

**Conclusion:** Based on all the previous implemented and on-going schemes this allows for a shorter, more engaged process for CPMS implementation.

### 2. ASSESSMENTS.

Once a parking problem has been brought to the attention of the Council with a request for service officers will carry out some basic investigations, which include site visits, review previous requests and engage with local councillors (if no correspondence previously existed). If it is shown that the reported parking problems are most likely commuter based the request the potential scheme will be added as to the future programme of CPMS, this will be done in agreement with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport for priority / ranking. If a parking problem is no longer evident or is not related to long term commuter problem then no further action would be taken and the interested parties advised of this course of action. However, the situation could be monitored on a six monthly basis by way of an informal site inspection.

When it is evident a parking problem does exist and is directly linked to long term commuters the potential scheme will be added to the future CPMS programme.

### 3. PARKING SURVEY:

The first stage to the implementation of CPMS is Parking Surveys. These consist of a vehicle capacity survey (volume) count in the identified affected streets at four times a

day e.g. say 6am, 10am, 2pm and 6pm. These counts would generally be supplemented by video and photographic records. The parking surveys would normally be carried out on a Tuesday or a Thursday and be supplemented by night time and early morning surveys if required. The surveys may also require some weekend assessments.

The area of the survey will be agreed with the relevant CPMS working group which will usually consist of the Portfolio Holder / Deputy Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport, local ward members and relevant officers. We also have scope to introduce street champions / resident group representatives from the area.

#### **4. QUALIFYING CRITERIA**

It is proposed that rules are set out and identified as qualifying criteria for a potential CPMS to progress, as follows:

**Qualifying Criteria RULE - That there is insufficient kerbside space in the community to accommodate all users when at least 75% of the measured available kerbside parking capacity is being used.**

**Kerbside Parking Capacity Qualifying Criteria Rule:** Following the parking survey and capture of the data, the street(s) kerbside capacity would be measured by subtracting lengths of kerblines that should not be parked over, e.g. such as driveways and within 10 metres (m) of junctions. The measurement (length of available kerblines) would then be divided by a factor of 6m, (standard parallel parking length), to assess the actual capacity of that kerblines in terms of numbers of vehicles that could be readily and safely accommodated.

For example if a length of kerblines was measured at 120m in length and then 30m of kerblines subtracted from this length as areas that vehicles should not park, then the resultant kerblines length available for parking is 90m. This figure of 90m is then divided by 6m, and the result is 15 number individual parking lengths of 6m. This is the number of vehicles that can be readily accommodated in that section of kerblines length and this is known as the Theoretical Kerblines Capacity and is at that level measured as 100%.

Once a street(s) theoretical capacity is measured it is then compared against parking survey data. From empirical observations it is known that kerblines in streets that are known to present parking problems are those where the actual parking levels are at or exceed a threshold of 75% theoretical capacity.

**CPMS Qualifying Criteria Rule Met?:** If the parking capacity threshold of 75% or more of theoretical kerbside capacity is not met then a scheme in that street should not be progressed and no further action would be proposed to be taken. Ward members would be briefed and then other stakeholders and interested parties would be advised of the CPMS assessment result in writing. However, the situation could be monitored on an on-going basis through infrequent site visits to record the current situation. This would be agreed at the appropriate working group.

If the parking problem was shown to have merit and the criteria rule (above) met then the scheme / relevant streets would progress onto the next stage of implementation, which would be agreed at the appropriate working group meeting.

There are of course exceptions to the above; it may be a case that a street may not show significant parking but its location within a potential zone may lead to migration, or a section of a street clearly shows significant problems but the other section does not due to the layout and may not meet the above qualifying criteria but may result in migration of traffic could still be included to move onto the next stage with agreement of the working group.

## **5. COMMUNITY SUPPORT – STAGE 1 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND VOTE**

Once a CPMS area has passed through the previous process the scheme will be put forward to all stakeholders in the community affected by high levels of parking congestion/ commuter parking. This engagement is an informal consultation (public engagement) but forms an essential element of gauging the level of community support from residents and businesses alike for a potential scheme to be introduced.

Stage 1 Public engagement, is the first stage to gaining public support, it would generally be a very basic “Are you interested in a CPMS?” question. At this stage no significant design or detail would be included. It would only detail the general principles of a CPMS and the area which is being engaged with.

A potential CPMS will either go through both Stage 1 & 2 public engagement or just Stage 2 public engagement, this will be dependent in the size, location etc of the potential CPMS.

Agreement will be made with the working group whether to carry out 1 or 2 stages of public engagement.

**Community Support Tests** - Community support is identified through 2 tests.

**Community Support Test 1 - YES VOTES vs ALL OTHER VOTES:** This is identified by the number of YES votes against all households in any particular street. This test takes into account all YES votes with those against containing NO votes, abstentions, empty properties and those that did not respond.

**GREEN SREETS** (YES vote greater than 50%)

**RED STREETS** (YES vote less than 50%)

**Community Support Test 2 - YES VOTES vs NO VOTES:** This further examines the voting results of the RED STREETS. This is a simple comparison of the actual YES/NO vote. If the total YES votes in that street are greater than the NO votes in that street then these streets are then identified as AMBER STREETS. Streets where NO votes are greater than YES votes are still identified as RED STREETS.

In summary following analysis of the voting results the streets and when both tests

are applied then the streets are identified as:

- **GREEN SREETS** (Meet both Community Support tests 1 and 2)
- **AMBER STREETS** (Meet only Community Support test 2)
- **RED STREETS** (Do not meet either Community Support tests 1 and 2)

All the streets, whether Green, Amber or Red are plotted on a drawing. CPMS areas are generally identified as separate areas/zones rather than individual streets. It can be seen that in areas with a majority of Green streets and the occasional Amber or Red Street, a general Green zone can then be identified. All the streets are then aggregated in this particular area/zone and if the Community Support rate meets the relevant Test 1 of 50% or greater support then this area/zone is included with the proposed CPMS.

This analysis is repeated until all individual areas/zones are analysed and then the full public engagement area will be annotated throughout as either a Green area (50% or above) or a Red area (below 50%).

Using this information an agreed CPMS area will be agreed with the working group, taking into account the Community Support Testing, potential gateway locations will then be assessed that identify appropriate entry/exit points of the CPMS. Gateways are assessed on site, taking into account property boundaries/locations and available space for signage. Thus ensuring that the signs will be visible (no obstruction from trees, prop properties etc.) to make the zone boundaries clearly visible.

## **6. COMMUNITY SUPPORT – STAGE 2 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND VOTE**

Stage 2 Public engagements, the second Public engagement will follow the same tests as above but will include a more detailed design, showing exact times of operation, details including other restrictions etc.

## 7. RECOMMENDATION

To continue with the implementation of the University & Millfield Area CPMS, Howick Park CPMS, Seaburn Amendment and Ashbrooke Thornholme (Hendon) Phase 2.

To recommend the CPMS investigation procedure in terms of assessment technique and qualifying criteria contained within this report to ensure resources are targeted to the most suitable areas.

To recommend the procedure for assessing the community support through public engagement and vote, using the 2 Community Support Tests identified in section 4 and 5.

To subject to available funding, resources and satisfactory completion of all statutory procedures, that it would be reasonable to deliver 1-2 discrete CPMS's per year over an 18 to 24 month period.

To recommend the priority list as follows to take forward to future introduction on site as a CPMS areas as follows

Area	Zone/Phase	Rank	Est Start	Est End
Doxford International (Moorside / East Herrington)	1	1	Jan 2019	Jan 2021
Seaburn Metro Phase 2	2	1	April 2019	April 2021
QAR	1	2	April 2020	April 2022
Hendon (High Street East)	1	2	July 2020	July 2022
Royal Hospital 5	5	3	April 2021	April 2023
Stadium of Light (Event)	3	3	August 2021	August 2023

To follow the CPMS procedure outlined in Appendix B.

## **Community Parking Management Scheme** **Streamlined Delivery 2019**

Once a parking problem has been brought to the attention of the Council via various Requests for Service (RfS) through Members of the public, Councilors, Portfolio Holder or MP's, investigations should take place into the history of the matter to determine if the issue is longstanding and linked to a commuter hub, e.g Hospital, Business Park, Metro Station (the list is not exhaustive).

- If a parking problem is not evident then no further action will be taken at this time. A formal response will be issued to all parties involved which could include residents, businesses, Portfolio Holder and Local Ward Members making them aware of the decision made. However, officers can continue to monitor the situation.
- If a parking problem is evident then a formal response will be issued to all parties, which will outline that the requested area will be added to the ongoing program of CPMS and on completion of any existing schemes we will look to start that area.

**Below outlines the basic stages to implement CPMS following the agreement that the scheme is included in the program**

### **Stage 1 -Initial Working Group**

Officers will arrange an initial working group, this should comprise of the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport, Local Ward Members, Council Officers and where available Residents Representatives (the resident's representative should be a nominated person from their local residents association group, in agreement with the Portfolio Holder)

This meeting will be used to discuss the parking issues and outline the CPMS process.

Council officers will supply a large plan showing the surrounding area to the reported parking problems and allow the Local Ward Members / Portfolio Holder to draw / advise on the exact areas that they would like us to progress the Parking Capacity Surveys.

At all stages through the process updates will be sent out via e-mail to the working group.

### **Stage 2 – Parking Capacity Surveys**

Parking Capacity Surveys will be carried out by Officers (generally) within the agreed scheme boundary.

These will consist of a parking capacity survey (volume counts) in the agreed streets. For the most accurate results surveys are to be carried out four times a day between 6.00am and 7.00am, 10.00am and 11.00am, 2.00pm and 3.00pm and 6.00pm to 7.00pm usually on a Tuesday and Thursday over a one or two week period (area size dependent) and must be in school term times (this will provide data for a typical working day). However the times and days of the surveys may vary on a scheme-by-scheme basis in agreement with the working group.

The survey itself will be done by video using the Infrastructure & Commercial Go-Pro and in car adapter.

Each street is to be video surveyed separately and they may need surveying in both directions depending on the width of the carriageway.

All data is to be downloaded into the scheme folder ensuring is correctly dated and timed for analysis.

### **Stage 3 – Analysis of Parking Surveys**

Following Stage 2 officers will now have the relevant information at hand to begin assessing each area / zone / street.

A basic qualifying criteria rule has been set for the for the potential CPMS.

**Qualifying Criteria RULE - That there is insufficient kerbside space in the community to accommodate all users when at least 75% of the measured available kerbside parking capacity is being used.**

**Kerbside Parking Capacity Qualifying Criteria Rule:** Following the parking survey and capture of the data, the street(s) kerbside capacity would be measured by subtracting lengths of kerblines that should not be parked over, e.g. such as driveways and within 10 metres (m) of junctions. The measurement (length of available kerblines) would then be divided by a factor of 6m, (standard parallel parking length), to assess the actual capacity of that kerblines in terms of numbers of vehicles that could be readily and safely accommodated.

For example if a length of kerblines was measured at 120m in length and then 30m of kerblines subtracted from this length as areas that vehicles should not park, then the resultant kerblines length available for parking is 90m. This figure of 90m is then divided by 6m, and the result is 15 number individual parking lengths of 6m. This is the number of vehicles that can be readily accommodated in that section of kerblines length and this is known as the Theoretical Kerblines Capacity and is at that level measured as 100%.

Once a street(s) theoretical capacity is measured it is then compared against parking survey data. From empirical observations it is known that kerblines in streets that are known to present parking problems are those where the actual parking levels are at or exceed a threshold of 75% theoretical capacity.



**CPMS Qualifying Criteria Rule Met?:** If the parking capacity threshold of 75% or more of theoretical kerbside capacity is not met then a scheme in that street should generally not be progressed and no further action would be proposed to be taken. Ward members would be briefed and then other stakeholders and interested parties would be advised of the CPMS assessment result in writing. However, the situation could be monitored on an on-going basis through infrequent site visits to record the current situation. This would be agreed at the appropriate working group.

If the parking problem was shown to have merit and the criteria rule (above) met then the scheme / zone would progress onto the next stage of implementation, which would be agreed at the working group meeting.

There are of course exceptions to the above; it may be a case that a street may not show significant parking but its location within a potential zone may lead to significant migration of vehicles if a scheme progresses in adjacent areas or streets or a section of a street clearly shows significant problems but the other section does not due to the layout, this mean it may not meet the above qualifying criteria but may result in migration of traffic, these streets could still be included to move onto the next stage with agreement of the working group.

Following full analysis of the streets AutoCAD drawings will be produced of the area. The drawings will show Red / Green streets, Red streets did not meet the criteria and Green streets did meet the criteria with other streets highlighted that are an exception to rule as set out above.

These drawings will be discussed at the next working group meeting.

#### **Stage 4 re convene working group**

Officers will arrange the second working group meeting. This meeting will be used to go through the parking survey results. At this stage an agreement will be made to carry out one or two public engagements. The option to do one or two engagements will be area linked to the overall area, reported parking issues and the parking survey results.

Council officers will supply further blank plans to allow the working group to outline the exact locations to carry out the public engagement exercise.

If the working group agrees to two engagements we will move to Stage 5, if only one engagement the scheme will progress straight to Stage 8.

#### **Stage 5 Public engagement vote 1**

Officers will now carry out the initial public engagement.

All documents to be sent to the working group via e-mail for comment in advance of being sent to the public.

Scheme size dependent we may speak to the procurement team to seek printing and delivery options as this can be the most cost effective way to get the document in the public realm or we may use available officers to print and deliver all public engagement documents.

With agreement of working group we also have the potential to use an online consultation section and / or provide drop off points within council run buildings for responses.

Organise a canvasser to visit the area to generate a higher response rate.

The public engagement document should contain as much information as possible and include;

- Letter introducing a CPMS, reasons for implementation and the basics of a CPMS
- A drawing showing the engagement area of the potential CPMS
- Tariff of charges
- List of FAQ's
- Return sheet for Vote / Comments

It can also potentially include –

State that comments made should be about this matter only and that no formal response will be made. Each individual comment will be read.

This will be the only opportunity for the next (x) years and so take careful consideration when voting.

The public engagement will last between 3 to 4 weeks for residents and stakeholders to return their vote and / or comments.

### **Stage 6 Public Engagement Analysis**

Officers will compile all responses and comments as they are received.

Officers will create plans showing how streets voted (RED,AMBER,GREEN) to show to discuss with the working group. A breakdown of recurring comments will also be compiled for further discussion.

### **Stage 7 re convene working group**

The third working group will go through the public engagement results and will allow the working group to agree which area(s) / zone(s) will progress to the second public engagement.

Council officers will supply further blank plans to allow the working group to outline the exact locations to carry out the second public engagement exercise.

Details will be further confirmed in to all potential restrictions, times of operations and limited bays / pay by phone bays etc to be included in the second public engagement.

### **Stage 8 Public engagement vote 2**

This stage will follow the similar steps as stage 5, however this engagement will include

- Parking Bays (P&D, Limited Waiting etc.)
- Junction Protection
- Limited Waiting Bays
- Repeater Plates
- Time of Operation
- Full Sign Details / Gateways and Locations

All documents will be sent to the working group via e-mail for comment in advance of being sent to the public.

The public engagement will last between 3 to 4 weeks for residents and stakeholders to return their vote and / or comments.

### **Stage 9 Second Public Engagement Analysis**

Officers will compile all responses and comments as they are received.

Officers will create plans showing how streets voted (RED,AMBER,GREEN) to show to discuss with the working group. A breakdown of recurring comments will also be compiled for further discussion.

### **Stage 10 Milestone Working Group Meeting**

Following analysis of the public engagement(s) and presentation to the working group, it will set out a clear view of areas / zones which would like to progress a CPMS and which do not want to progress further.

A pack will be produced by the CPMS Team and handed out to the working group for consideration; the pack will contain the results of the Public Engagement Exercise(s) which will address the voting and the final scheme design including reasoning behind decisions made if any alterations are required.

The FINAL Scheme Design will include drawings showing;

- Overall Scheme Layout
- Gateway Sign Locations

- Repeater Sign Locations (these are usually installed on existing lighting columns within the CPMS, locations of these columns can be easily obtained via the MAP3D)
- Road Marking Removals
- Road Marking Installations

With agreement of the working group officers will then progress the scheme to the Statutory / Legal Stage.

### **Stage 11 Delegated Decision**

Officers will complete the relevant Delegated Decision to allow the scheme to progress.

### **Stage 12 Scheme update / results**

Scheme update, if agreed at the previous working group a scheme update may be issued to inform residents etc that the scheme will progress through the Statutory / Legal stages. It should also inform of any changes to the original proposals and why.

### **Stage 13 Pre-Contractor Engagement / Scheme Estimates**

Arrange meetings with the relevant contractors to discuss their aspect of the work and availability. A accurate set of timescales and resources needs to be confirmed via the contractor.

### **Stage 14 Statutory / Legal Stage**

The TRO Team to progress.

During this stage it is worth noting that when a member of the TRO Team is creating the legal order / measuring a member of the design team should also be onsite this will reduce errors during the onsite setting out if the scheme is to be implemented.

It is worth noting the gaps which occur between road markings e.g. Double Yellow Lines and Parking bays needs to be taken into consideration (this will reduce errors / discrepancies picked up during the snagging stage)

Any final decision should lie with the CPMS Team representative.

### **Stage 15 – Pre Construction / Site Meeting / Order of Works**

The CPMS team will meet with the relevant contractors to discuss all associated works and programme.

### **Stage 16 – Site Setting Out / TRO Team pre construction spot checks**

CPMS Team representative and TRO Team representative will set out all associated works and restrictions in line with the TRO / Legal Order.

#### **Stage 17 Residents Letter**

The parking services Team will issue letters to residents with an estimated GO Live date and details of permits and how to obtain permits.

#### **Stage 18 Onsite Works Start**

A CPMS Team representative will monitor the on-site works and supply updates to the working group as work progresses.

#### **Stage 19 Legal Order Created**

TRO Team / Legal to carry out this stage

#### **Stage 20 Snagging / 2 week warning period**

During the first two weeks of a scheme going live officers will carry out snagging and CEO's will issue warnings to drivers within the zones.

#### **Stage 21 Scheme Sign off / Start of PCNs**

#### **Stage 22 Post implementation monitoring / issues raised**

Officers will continue to monitor the scheme on site and compile all resident concerns; this will usually be for one month.

#### **Stage 23 Final Working Group Meeting**

A proposed final working group meeting will be held to discuss the schemes impact.

It will also be agreed if or when a post implementation working group may be held. This is usually between 6 month and 12 month from Go live date.

Whilst the details set out above outline the general process of a CPMS Implementation, the process can be fluid with added working group meetings and or different levels of engagement. All changes would be agreed with the working group.