

## Public Questions for

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE to be held on THURSDAY 14 JUNE 2018 in the Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Ebley Wharf, Stroud at 7.00pm.

Nailsworth Town Council wishes to ask the following questions:

An appointed group of councillors has reviewed the publicly available papers and their concerns are detailed below.

The overriding question, supported by the remaining ones is:

Q1 Does the Committee believe that this paper is ready for consultation based on our queries and questions below?

Q1.1 This paper is completely focussing on methodology of charging for parking - but what is the purpose of the review: income or management?

---

## 2 Survey Data information

Q2.1 Full information is not available in the papers published (e.g. Arup's car park surveys) How can the Committee make a decision to go for consultation without this information being available to them?

Q2.2 Background information such as the occupancy surveys methodology is necessary in order for towns to properly review the proposals. Where is this information available?

Q2.3 What assessment had been made of the nature of visits made by car to Nailsworth. Where from, how long parked for, what purpose, how much spent in town, how likely to revisit?

Q2.4 What assessment has been made of the importance of the car borne visitor to the towns involved?

Q2.5 Whilst the Parking Surveys were carried out what assessments were carried out on other parking locations in Nailsworth - on-street, private car park etc.?

Q2.6 Why does the methodology used not identify whether workers are taking up parking spaces? (there is no evidence of this beyond anecdote)

Q2.7 Has an impact assessment been carried out? If not, why not?

Q2.8 Has the effect on non-retail and catering activities been considered?

---

## 3 Concepts and methodology

Q3.1 Officers' report confirms that legal powers to set parking charges are to 'secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic in the locality' along with air quality, amenity, access to premises, access for emergency vehicles. (2.4). Why is no direct evidence is provided to demonstrate any of this is a problem in Nailsworth? It is simply inferred from claim car parks are at capacity.

Q3.2 Why has population been used as a benchmark delineator when numbers and types of visitor, numbers and types of retail/catering outlet, gravity modelling of the the effect of pricing on the attractiveness of competing locations, etc. are more relevant than population?

Q3.4 Why, when the ATCM (a National organisation largely for towns and cities with Managed Centres) is used as Parking Industry Research, has the benchmark data been restricted to local and regional towns in Gloucestershire, Worcestershire and Somerset?

Q3.5 What account has been taken of the differing nature of the towns included in the proposal - Nailsworth has a successful experiential town centre and is unlike the towns used for benchmarking in the paper?

Q3.6 This report gives no consideration of the consequences of introducing charging will have on parking on the street and private parking. The effect will be greater demand for on-street parking on roads in and around the town centre, and worryingly the large private car park outside Morrisons. This will result in more vehicle manoeuvring within the town centre, creating congestion and impeding traffic flows; more on street parking in adjacent residential roads, most of which are narrow, causing more congestion and inconveniencing residents. This is in direct contradiction to the rationale in paragraph in 2.4 Any changes to car parking arrangements require comprehensive consideration of all on and off street parking including private car parks, for both long and short stay users. Why has this not been done?

Q3.7 Why is no evidence provided that the 85% capacity 'industry standard' is appropriate in Nailsworth – a small town with small highly visible car parks? The British Parking Association is a lobby group for operators of paid car parks and so cannot be viewed to be independent, nor to be experts in fragmented car parking arrangements such as in Nailsworth. If instead a capacity limit of 93% is used, capacity is never exceeded!

Q3.8 It is stated that 'there is little published evidence which links changes in car park charges to changes in town centre footfall' (Arup 5.5). This is used to justify imposing car parking charges, however, the very lack of evidence means that on the precautionary principle parking charges should not be introduced until it can be demonstrated that they will not have a adverse effect on footfall. In the absence of a proper evidence base, how can it be acceptable to introduce charges that are likely to significantly damage the economy and community of Nailsworth and the town centre?

Q3.9 Why are the specific circumstances of Nailsworth not considered? For example

- A substantial proportion of the population lives at the top of a long steep hill and public transport is derisory. Thus the likelihood of charging significantly influencing modal split in favour of walking and cycling is very small
- there is no station or commuter hub, or major publicly provided facility such as swimming pool, music/arts venue, museum, sports, leisure centre etc.
- most of the limited evidence presented derives from different, much larger places. It is not demonstrated that this reads across to Nailsworth

---

## 4 Potential Costings and income

Q4.1 What is the breakdown of operating costs for Car Parks (and Nailsworth's in particular) as opposed to the total given in the report?

Q4.2 What is the breakdown of Support Services cited in the report?

Q4.3 Are these Support Services employed entirely for supporting Car Parks?

Q4.4 Income forecasts in Table 4 have been set against the figures from Stonehouse. Why has only one car park been used for this important calculation? Figures from towns with similar visit patterns to Nailsworth should be used.

Q4.5 The Gross Income Level is estimated at £149,000. Is this net of VAT?

Q4.6 What is the breakdown of how the income is to be achieved: length of stay, nature of stay, location?

Q4.7 What is the stress variation in the Gross Income Level. i.e. the lowest level predicted and the highest level?

Q4.8 The gross revenue expenditure is estimated at £83,000 is this net of VAT?

Q4.9 These figures show an increase of £48,000pa for the introduction of charging. What is the breakdown of these costs, both in detail and geographically and what is the stress variation in them?

Q4.10 Figures provided only show one year, a consultation of this magnitude should be illustrated with a 5 year forecast of numbers, including a sensitivity analysis of the potential changes in business rates regime. Why has this not been done?

Q4.11 Bike parking - there is no evidence at all for any unfulfilled bike parking. On what basis is this provision included in the paper?

Q4.12 When asked about providing charging points in Nailsworth the CE of local green electricity company stated that there is no demand for town centre charging points, the demand is on longer distance routes. On what basis is this provision included in the paper?