# **Transport and Environment Committee**

10.00am, Tuesday, 4 June 2013

# **Controlled Parking Zone - Amendments to Residents' Permits Eligibility**

Item number Report number Wards	7.7 5 – Inverleith				
	<ul> <li>6 - Corstorphine/Murrayfield</li> <li>7 - Sighthill/Gorgie</li> <li>9 - Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart</li> <li>10 - Meadows/Morningside</li> <li>11 - City Centre</li> <li>12 - Leith Walk</li> <li>15 - Southside/Newington</li> </ul>				
Links					
Coalition pledgesP8, P17, and P50					
Council outcomes	<u>CO19, CO22, CO24, CO25, CO26</u>				
Single Outcome Agreement	All				

#### **Mark Turley**

Director of Services for Communities

Contact: Phil Noble, Senior Professional Officer (Strategic Planning)

E-mail: Phil.Noble@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 469 3803



# **Executive summary**

# Controlled Parking Zone - Amendments to Residents' Permits Eligibility

#### Summary

This report seeks approval to amend the policy relating to the types of property that are eligible for residents' permits following development or redevelopment. Residents of most conversions to flats in the city centre would become entitled to one permit per dwelling; residents of purpose built student accommodation would continue not to be entitled to permits.

The purpose of the change is to achieve an appropriate balance between encouraging new housing in the city centre and minimising the increase in parking pressure imposed by new developments. The change is proposed following a representation from a developer.

#### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that Committee approves amendment of the policy relating to the eligibility criteria for residents permits for new developments to the position set out in Appendix 1.

#### **Measures of success**

The intended outcomes are removal of a barrier to re-development of city centre properties to residential use and clarification of the position in relation to the entitlement to permits of students living in purpose built student accommodation.

#### **Financial impact**

The effects of the changes outlined in this report on residents permit eligibility are likely to only marginally affect income. The effect has not been costed due to the difficulty in estimating the number of properties likely to be affected and the marginal effect anticipated.

The costs of staff time and advertising costs to progress the necessary amendments to traffic orders will be contained within existing budgets. The advertising costs for any amendments to orders in relation to individual new developments will be included in the costs to be met by that development.

# **Equalities impact**

Exemptions from restrictions on permit availability will apply to disabled people. No other adverse impacts are anticipated in relation to equalities and rights legislation.

## **Sustainability impact**

The impacts of this report in relation to the three elements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 Public Bodies Duties have been considered, and the outcomes are summarised below. Relevant Council sustainable development policies have been taken into account.

The proposals in this report are, on balance, expected to reduce carbon emissions, increase the city's resilience to climate change impacts and help achieve a sustainable Edinburgh as they will encourage city centre living, which tends to be less cardependant.

# **Consultation and engagement**

Councillors for Wards affected by the proposals in this report have been consulted on them. Councillors Burgess, Corbett and Bagshaw expressed concerns about the proposals on the grounds that they are likely to increase the pressure on permit spaces, that they may encourage greater car use by city centre residents and that they undermine efforts to encourage more active travel.

The change will be taken through the statutory process for Traffic Regulation Orders. No additional consultation is proposed.

## **Background reading/external references**

Appendix 1 Categories of property and eligibility for permits (change in italics).

Report to Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee: February 2010. "Controlled Parking Zone - Amendments to Residents' Permits Eligibility."

# Controlled Parking Zone - Amendments to Residents' Permits Eligibility

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 In February 2010 the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee approved modifications to residents' permit eligibility relating to new development. These changes were introduced to reduce the parking pressure imposed on existing residents by new development.
- 1.2 In summary, the situation following these changes is as follows:
  - a) new residential properties in the central and peripheral Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), Zones 1 to 8, are not eligible for residents' parking permits. This includes properties in the Quartermile and Fountain North developments;
  - b) new residential properties in the extended Controlled Parking Zone, are eligible for one residents' permit per property only;
  - newly sub-divided residential properties in the Controlled Parking Zone are eligible for one residents' permit for the original property only; and
  - d) for all other properties in the CPZ, residents are eligible for up to two permits per household.
- 1.3 Exceptions are as follows:
  - a) where a former residential property is being converted back to residential use from some other use class. In this case the number of permits is limited to the original number of properties;
  - b) disabled drivers exemption assessed individually; and
  - c) where a developer is providing on-street parking or improving the layout of existing on-street spaces. Such developments are eligible for one permit for each new space being created. The developer is required to nominate the specific properties to be eligible for a permit.

#### 2. Main report

- 2.1 Parking for new residential development in the city centre raises complex issues and there are competing pressures. Underlying these is a desire, for a variety of policy reasons, to support city centre living. With this in mind, on the one hand there is clearly a case for facilitating city centre housing redevelopment, by allowing exactly the same rights to residents permits for residents of new/newly converted properties as for those living in older established dwellings. On the other hand, existing residents already face significant parking difficulties. So there is a good policy case for adopting measures which try to avoid increasing these problems, such as those approved in the February 2010 report.
- 2.2 A representation has been received from a developer that the operation of the February 2010 policy poses significant issues for the redevelopment of some city centre property types. The particular concern raised was around the redevelopment of listed properties.
- 2.3 Such redevelopments can often involve the re-conversion to residential use of offices originally built as two dwellings, a large terraced house over a basement flat. It is very often impractical to incorporate any new off-street car parking in this type of redevelopment, and even physically practical options (for example the conversion of rear gardens to parking) are usually undesirable for other policy reasons. Under the terms of the current policy only two permits would be available for typically four or more flats, leaving two or more households without permits. In situations where purpose built offices are being converted to housing no permits would be issued.
- 2.4 The current policy has the effect of creating an incentive for developers to provide off street car parking and/or discouraging car ownership by residents of new city centre property. Both these outcomes are desirable. However it is acknowledged that the policy may present a barrier to certain types of development, for example conversion to flats aimed at the higher end of the residential market. This may have knock-on effects on the ability of the market to support otherwise desirable conversions of large dwellings or offices to flats.

- 2.5 The 2010 eligibility revisions did not deal clearly with the issue of new student housing. The revisions set out below clarify the position. Residents of new student housing would not be entitled to residents' parking permits this is in line with the approach currently taken for student residents of halls of residence. This would apply to all purpose-built student housing, including existing housing, but not to general housing that happens to be rented by students.
- 2.6 With the above in mind it is proposed to change the eligibility criteria to those set out in Appendix 1.
- 2.7 In summary, the effect of the proposed changes would be to:
  - a) increase the permit allowance to one per household for developments in the central and peripheral Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), in the following cases:
    - i) New development on a gap site, making provision of off street parking impractical, or undesirable for other policy reasons;
    - ii) Sub-division of residential properties, or conversion from other uses utilising buildings that either:
      - have the character of dwellings and/or
      - are listed buildings.
  - b) confirm the non-entitlement to residents parking permits for students living in purpose-built accommodation.
- 2.8 In order to ameliorate any impacts of this change on existing residents, it is proposed, where appropriate, to seek a contribution from developers to the conversion of residents' only and pay and display parking in the vicinity of relevant developments to shared use parking. In general this is likely to increase the availability of parking spaces for permit holders during the operating hours of the Controlled parking Zone.

## 3. Recommendations

3.1 It is recommended that Committee approves amendment of the policy relating to the eligibility criteria for residents permits for new developments to the postion set out in Appendix 1.

## Mark Turley

Director of Services for Communities

# Links

Coalition pledges	<ul> <li>P8 - Make sure the city's people are well-housed, including encouraging developers to build residential communities, starting with brownfield sites</li> <li>P17- Continue efforts to develop the city's gap sites and encourage regeneration</li> <li>P50 - Meet greenhouse gas targets, including the national target of a 42 per cent reduction by 2020,</li> </ul>
Council outcomes	CO19 – Attractive Places and Well Maintained – Edinburgh remains an attractive city through the development of high quality buildings and places and the delivery of high standards and maintenance of infrastructure and public realm; CO22 – Moving efficiently – Edinburgh has a transport system that improves connectivity and is green, healthy and accessible; CO24 – The Council communicates effectively internally and externally and has an excellent reputation for customer care; CO25 – the Council has efficient and effective services that deliver on objectives; CO26 –The Council engages with stakeholders and works in partnership to improve services and deliver on agreed objectives.
Single Outcome Agreement	All - An effective, accessible, transport network underpins all four priorities in the current Single Outcome Agreement.
Appendices	Appendix 1 - Categories of property and eligibility for permits (changes in italics)

#### Appendix 1: Categories of property: Existing and proposed eligibility for permits (changes in italics)

Property category	Permits per household		<b>Exceptions</b> <sup>1</sup> – <i>italicised where</i> <i>the exception is newly proposed</i>
Existing	Propos ed	in this report. See note 1 for general exceptions	

Residential properties in the central and peripheral Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Zones 1 to 8 - intended for general use.

Α	New build	None	None	Properties being constructed on a narrow <sup>2</sup> 'gap' site which makes provision of on-site parking either impractical or undesirable. In this case Residents would be entitled to 1 permit per household.
В	<ul> <li>Newly sub-divided or converted, utilising buildings that either:</li> <li>a. were originally dwellings or,</li> <li>b. have the character of dwellings<sup>3</sup> and/or</li> <li>c. are listed buildings</li> </ul>	One per original property	One	Properties where there is scope to provide sufficient off –street car parking to provide 1 space per dwelling without compromising other Planning policies. No entitlement in these cases.
С	<b>Newly sub-divided or converted,</b> utilising buildings that do not fall into any of the categories set out in B above.	None	None	Properties on a narrow <sup>2</sup> 'gap' site which makes provision of on-site parking either impractical or undesirable. As A above.

D	New build	One	One	None
E	Sub divided, or converted	One per original property	One	None
<b>New build and converted</b> <i>student housing</i> <sup>4</sup> in the central, peripheral and extended Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)				

F	All student housing <sup>4</sup>	None	None	None
---	----------------------------------	------	------	------

#### See overleaf for notes to this table



#### Notes.

- 1 General exceptions
  - a) Disabled drivers or live-in carers of a disabled person exempt from restrictions. Other carers of disabled people dealt with on a case by case basis
  - b) Where a developer is providing on-street parking or improving the layout of existing on-street spaces. Such developments will be dealt with on a case by case basis.
- 2 'Narrow' will be defined on a site by site basis. In these cases the usual position will be to allow one permit per household.
- 3 For example buildings that may have been built all or part as offices or shops that are in buildings similar in character to primarily residential properties on the same street.
- 4 Student housing was not discussed separately in the February 2010 proposals. Permits are not currently issued for this type of housing.