

## Item

# Management of Residents Car Parking Spaces provided on Housing Land Within Neighbourhoods and on Future New Builds Across the City

**To:** Councillor Mike Todd-Jones Executive Councillor for Housing  
Housing Scrutiny Committee

**Report by:**

David Greening, Head of Housing Services

Tel: 01223 - 457997

Email: david.greening@cambridge.gov.uk

**Wards affected:**

All

## 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out a car parking strategy for both existing residents' car parking and future new build sites. Its aim is to provide a template for parking management at new and existing City Homes neighbourhood car parking areas across the City.
- 1.2 When early social housing estates were built, car ownership was at a much lower level and this was reflected in the level of parking provision in the original designs. The continued increase in car ownership within these estates is becoming a growing problem for residents living in these neighbourhoods. Residents report that the car parking areas are often misused, for example, by commuters finding a cheap alternative option for free parking or by general inconsiderate parking by other residents. The outcome is that car parking capacity is reduced, and residents are unable to park within a reasonable distance of their homes.

- 1.3 In response to the parking limitations described, residents can request minor parking scheme changes. This has resulted in a fragmented development of schemes and a burden of administrative and technical resource requirements which is unsustainable. A more cohesive approach to managing car parking on both existing and new build developments equitably is required.
- 1.4 In addition to the challenges described with existing social housing estates, Cambridge City Council has had planning approval for its 500 new Council homes programme – the 500 Programme. The 500 homes are being built in a number of developments across the city of Cambridge and beyond. These developments have been submitted to planning with designated access strategies, which includes the number of parking spaces and their locations within the development. Up until now there has not been a clearly defined parking strategy to provide guidance on how car parking will be managed once the sites are operational as living spaces.
- 1.5 This strategy will provide a template for parking management at new and existing City Homes neighbourhood car parking sites across the City. It will also help to ensure that parking management is designed into developments at pre-planning stage to ensure that post-handover the challenges described are minimised or avoided altogether.
- 1.6 EV charging points on existing estates is not in scope for this report. EV charging points at new build sites are served by the parking bays referenced within this report and as such access to them will be managed in line with the proposed parking strategy. Operation of the charge points themselves is not within the scope of this report.

The Council do not currently have a report planned for EV charge points. The HDA will continue to provide EV chargers in line with planning obligations linked to the Council's Climate Change Strategy. The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Construction SPD states that planning policy is: 50% active and 50% passive on all developments. We estimate that by 2028, on CIP developments, there will be 477 active EV charge points and nearly 1000 passive charge points installed across the 500 and 1000 programmes.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To agree to the approach to parking as set out in Figure 1 and utilise this approach across new build sites, except for those that are managed by third parties (e.g. Management Company).
- 2.2 To agree to use Cambridgeshire County Council's Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) enforcement on the existing resident car parking areas identified by City Homes in the future.

## 3. New Build Sites

- 3.1 The Parking Strategy recommendation has been provided by the Council's Housing Development Agency (H.D.A) in agreement with City Homes, Community Services, Estates and Facilities, and Parking Service, who have all been consulted in relation to **new build sites**.
- 3.2 The recommended strategy is as follows: Where there are less than 15 parking bays onsite then bollards and County Council enforcement (such as Fixed Penalty Notices for non-permitted cars) will be utilised. Where there are 15 to 49 car parking bays onsite County Council enforcement will be utilised. Where there are 50 plus parking bays then County Council enforcement and barriers will be utilised. Figure 1 summarises this approach.

Number of Bays	Bollards	County Enforcement	Barrier
<15	Y	Y	N
15 to 49	N	Y	N
50+	N	Y	Y*

Figure 1

\*If the parking area has three or fewer vehicle access points, then a barrier is suitable.

- 3.3 As shown in Figure 1, parking enforcement requirements vary, depending on a number of factors, and it is not possible to apply a single approach to

all car parks. The recommendations for each car park have been applied taking the following factors into consideration:

- Effectiveness in preventing misuse of residential parking bays
- The business case for the Council
- Resource requirements of the Council
- Ease of use for residents

3.4 The expectation is that the approach to parking as set out in Figure 1 will be utilised in forthcoming new build programmes as set out in Figure 2, and across the forthcoming 500 and the 1000 programme approved in the September 2020 HSC. The two programmes - the 500 programme, and the 1,000 programme - will deliver over 1,500 net Council rented and mixed tenure homes, several community centres and commercial units, with a significant number of private homes also being built. As a result of these developments, there will be new parking bays which will require management to ensure they are restricted for use by residents who they are allocated to.

3.5 The Council, through its joint venture with Hill Partnerships, the Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP), has had planning approval for 526 affordable homes and 295 private homes. Serving these will be 299 aboveground parking bays which will require strategic management.

3.6 The table below shows the new build developments for which planning has been approved, and the parking management solution recommended for each. These are taken from planning documents and the number of parking bays is subject to change. The table is simply to provide a guide for deciding the appropriate strategy for each site

<b>Development</b>	<b>Total Parking Bays</b>	<b>Strategy</b>
Akeman Street	10	County Enforcement and Bollards
Anstey Way <sup>1</sup>	50	County Enforcement
Buchan Street	20	County Enforcement
Campkin Road <sup>2</sup>	60	County Enforcement
Colville Road Garages	6	Bollards
Colville Road Phase 2	45	County Enforcement
Cromwell Road	24	County Enforcement
L2, Orchard Park <sup>3</sup>	9	County Enforcement
Meadows <sup>4</sup>	39	Barrier and Fob

Markham Close	5	Bollards
Mill Road Surface <sup>5</sup>	4	County Enforcement
Nuns Way & Wiles Close	2	Bollards
Queens Meadow	4	Bollards
Ventress Close	17	County Enforcement
Wulfstan Way	4	Bollards
<b>Total</b>	<b>299</b>	
Underground bays at Mill Road and Cromwell managed by ManCo	115	Barrier and Fob
<b>Total</b>	<b>414</b>	

<sup>1</sup>More than three vehicle access points

<sup>2</sup>Three or fewer vehicle access points

<sup>3</sup>There are 26 spaces in total, with 9 allocated to the Council

<sup>4</sup>There is a Community Centre Car Park in this location in addition to the 39 spaces

<sup>5</sup>County Enforcement in this area will also include other tenures of property

Figure 2

3.7 Please note, Mill Road and Cromwell Road are both large mixed tenure sites and they have underground parking areas which will be served by a barrier and gate system. These underground parking areas will be managed by a Management Company (ManCo) of which the council has a golden share - that is, the Council will have overall control of the ManCo. The enforcement of these car parks will be managed by the ManCo. The council will still generate revenue from these bays and this revenue has been included in the costings in section 8 – Financial Implications. This model is also likely to be used on similar mixed tenure sites as they arise in the future.

3.8 In addition, in the January 2021 Housing Scrutiny Committee, the council approved new sustainability standards updating its Sustainable Housing Design Guide. In line with the council's climate change commitments, parking ratios for new developments from 2021 will be reduced as the council will target Passivhaus certification for its schemes necessitating enhanced parking management (See Figure 3).

	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Local Plan Plus</b>	<b>Passivhaus Certification</b>	<b>Net Zero Carbon</b>
Car park ratios across sites	~0.7-0.9 parking spaces per home.	~0.5-0.6 parking spaces per home.	0.5 parking spaces per home.	<0.5 parking spaces per home.

Figure 3

3.8 Whilst parking ratios will be reduced, parking bay ratios for mobility impaired users will be maintained as required for planning policy. This means that 5% of homes in all developments will be required to be wheel chair accessible and will, therefore, need a mobility-impaired parking bay regardless of parking ratios.

## 4. Existing City Homes Neighbourhood Car Parking Areas

### 4.1 Parking Management Options

Below is a summary of the four parking management solutions that have been considered for use at City Homes newbuild sites (to include existing parking at Wilson Close). These solutions are currently used at existing neighbourhood car parking sites where problems with car parking have been identified by City Homes and/or residents:

#### 4.1.1 Solution 1: Maintain the status quo

Allow residents to manage their own parking

##### **Advantages:**

- No capital cost to the Council

##### **Risks:**

- Dissatisfaction amongst residents due to lack of enforced bays leading to misuse
- Resource requirements to deal with potential increase in complaints and enquiries regarding parking

#### **4.1.2 Solution 2: Bollards**

The Council installs a lockable bollard to each bay and allocates each bay to a resident. The resident then provides their own key to lock the bollard when in use.

##### **Advantages:**

- Requires minimal management from the Council
- Residents manage their own bay as they are responsible for locking and unlocking their allocated bollard/space

##### **Risks:**

- Cumbersome for residents to use – requirement to get in and out of car to lock/unlock the bollard takes time and not ideal in poor weather conditions, or when in a rush
- Significant capital cost required for hardware and installation
- Easily damaged, leading to significant maintenance/replacement costs
- If damaged, enforcement function is reduced
- Resource requirement to deal with day to day issues

#### **4.1.3 Solution 3: County Council enforcement**

This will require use of the Council's ongoing agreement with Cambridgeshire County Council for public enforcement of Cambridge City Council off-street parking places. Sites to be added to the Council's Off-Street Traffic Regulation Order so that they can be enforced by roving County Council Enforcement Officers, who issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) of £60 for anyone who parks in a restricted bay without displaying a valid permit. For all new build sites, the cost of a parking permit that allows parking in a dedicated space would be charged at the prevailing parking space charge as approved in the HRA Budget Setting report each year, with two rates applicable for city centric parking spaces and those outside of the city centre. Parking permits on the older council sites where a permit does not guarantee a space will continue to be charged at the lower parking permit rate.

##### **Advantages:**

- Low capital cost
- Low maintenance cost
- Provides enforcement function for all sites
- Easily managed along with existing council residents parking schemes
- The County Council keep the revenue earned from the PCNs, thus providing incentive to concentrate on areas of misuse
- County Council Parking Control team deal with day to day issues

**Risks:**

- County Council Enforcement Officer resources cannot always be guaranteed as they are not in our control

**4.1.4 Solution 4: Barrier and Fob**

A barrier system to control the entry and exit of each site, with use of a fob system to allow access for residents. An intercom system with keypad linked to each home can allow access for visitors/deliveries.

**Advantages:**

- Restricts unauthorised access to car park

**Risks:**

- Installation and maintenance cost
- Barriers are easily damaged
- If the barrier is damaged, enforcement function reduced
- Resource requirement to manage day to day issues

**5. Options Appraisal**

5.1 The following options appraisal has been carried out in consultation with City Homes, Housing Finance, H.D.A, Estates and Facilities, Parking Services and the HSC Resident Representatives.

**5.1.1 Enforcement Requirements**

Figure 4 is a table appraisal of each of the options against criteria defined as key in providing an enforcement service to the Council’s HRA managed car park sites.

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Status quo</b>	<b>Bollards</b>	<b>County Council enforcement</b>	<b>Barrier and fob</b>
<b>1</b>	Provides parking enforcement	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>2</b>	Allows chargeable permits	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>4</b>	Provides access control to parking bays	Yes	No	No	Yes
<b>5</b>	Guaranteed enforcement 24/7	No	No	No	No
<b>6</b>	Easy to use for Residents	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<b>8</b>	Risk to enforcement when hardware is damaged	No	Yes	No	Yes
<b>9</b>	Low Capital Cost	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>10</b>	Low Maintenance Cost	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>11</b>	Allows visitors to park in bays*	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<b>12</b>	Offers daily/hourly bookings via JustPark*	No	No	Yes	No
<b>13</b>	Offers booking/charging flexibility via JustPark*	No	No	Yes	No

\*Optional

Figure 4

5.1.2 The table shows County Enforcement to be the best solution in terms of meeting the key criteria, and the number of requirements that it meets. Where it may not be the best solution is on sites that have multiple user types and existing car parking issues. For example, on a mixed-use site, away from the city centre, where there is a community centre, commercial units and residential units, it may be difficult for enforcement officers to attend reactively in time to issue tickets for shoppers parking in residential bays which prohibits someone returning home from being able to park. In this instance, bollards or barriers may be more suitable as they can provide preventative enforcement without people resources being required to attend.

5.1.3 If preventative, access-controlling enforcement is required, then the number of bays and vehicle access points in the parking area can help to determine whether bollards or a barrier is the preferred solution. Out of the two options, bollards are usually more cost effective in car parks with fewer bays as they are purchased on a per-bay basis. A barrier is likely to be more cost effective in car parks with more bays as the number required is relative to the number of entrances (providing the car park is enclosed). It is therefore important that on larger mixed-use sites, that the layout of the car park is designed with minimal entrances to allow for a more cost-effective single or double barrier solution.

5.1.4 Where there is visitor parking available, visitor permits will be applied for by residents (at a cost determined by City Homes) and must be displayed in the visitor’s vehicle when parked in a visitors’ bay. This is applicable to Blue Badge holders as they must prove that they are a visitor to a resident of the site.

## 6. Staff Resourcing

6.1 Figure 5 provides an indication of where responsibility could sit in terms of management of each solution. This is subject to agreement between City Homes and the relevant Service.

<b>Staff Resourcing Requirements</b>	<b>Status quo</b>	<b>Bollards</b>	<b>County Council enforcement</b>	<b>Barrier and fob</b>
<b>Issue permits</b>	N/A	N/A	Business Support	N/A

<b>Issue keys/fobs</b>	N/A	City Homes	N/A	City Homes
<b>Manage Enforcement Complaints</b>	City Homes	City Homes	County Council	City Homes
<b>Hardware Maintenance</b>	N/A	City Homes	N/A	Estates and Facilities
<b>Management of Penalty Charge Notices</b>	N/A	N/A	County Council	N/A
<b>Management of day to day queries</b>	City Homes	City Homes	City Homes	City Homes

Figure 5

6.2 City Homes has found that a significant amount of officer time is spent dealing with parking enquiries at existing sites and this should be a consideration for future sites, especially as there will be a significant increase in the number of Council homes delivered as part of the 500 and 1,000 programmes. Taking this into account, the above table shows that County Council enforcement is the least resource intensive for City Homes and so is recommended on this front for existing resident car parking sites where car parking issues are identified.

## 7. Recommendation

7.1 It is recommended that the approach to parking set out in Figure 1 is utilised for new build sites, with the exception of those sites that are managed by third parties (e.g. ManCo).

7.2 To agree to use Cambridgeshire County Council's Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) Enforcement on existing resident car parking areas highlighted with car parking issues identified by City Homes and /or residents.

## 8. Financial Implications

8.1 Figure 6 below shows the potential revenue that could be made over 10 years if the recommended strategy for new build sites was used and every

available bay was let on an individual basis, separate to housing tenancies. These are estimated costs and subject to market conditions.

Total Parking Bays	Bollards	County Enforcement	Barrier	Capital Cost	Annual Cost	Annual Revenue	Whole Life Cost (10 years)
299	5	9	1	£70k	£23k	(£226k)	£1.96m

Figure 6

8.2 Figure 6 demonstrates that by using mainly County Enforcement, the Council could make £1.96m over 10 years. If all enforcement was carried out through bollards, this figure is estimated to be significantly lower and with barriers, it is estimated to cost the council more money than the income it generates.

8.3 Costs associated with introducing TRO's on identified City Homes residents' car parks in the future can be funded from existing budgets.

**a) Staffing Implications**

None.

**b) Equality and Poverty Implications**

Parking bay ratios for mobility impaired users will be maintained as required for planning policy.

People with a disability may be impacted by this policy. Generally people with a disability benefit from well enforced parking schemes as it will ensure disabled parking bays are only used by those entitled to do so.

Further consultation and review is required to establish the best way to offer facilities to people who receive informal care from friends or family.

**c) Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental Implications**

This policy will enable us to better manage car parking within our housing estates and may encourage people to use their car less often. This is particularly the case for non-residents who are using our estates as free parking and may now consider public transport offers better value for money.

**d) Procurement Implications**

None.

## e) Community Safety Implications

None.

## 9. Consultation and communication considerations

9.1 HSC Residents Representatives have been consulted prior to report coming to committee.

9.2 City Homes Housing Officers.

9.3 Housing Finance

9.4 Housing Development Agency (HDA)

9.5 Estates and Facilities

9.6 Parking Services

## 10. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Anna Hill (Housing Services Manager) tel: 01223 458312

email: [anna.hill@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:anna.hill@cambridge.gov.uk).

Or

Jake Smith (HDA Development Officer) tel: 01223 457517

email: [jake.smith@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:jake.smith@cambridge.gov.uk)