

South Somerset District Council

District-wide Car Parking Strategy

**Part 2: Study Report
Version 5.4 - Consultation Draft**

**Project Centre
Saffron Court
14B St Cross Street
London, EC1N 8XA**

Contents

1.	Background	3
2.	Data Collection	4
3.	Survey Analysis	5
4.	Demand Profiles	12
5.	Supply-Demand comparison	15
6.	Options to address imbalance	24
	Review of Parking Stock	
	Tariff & Control changes	
	Additional Provision	
	De-criminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE)	
	Modal Shift	
7.	Towards a parking strategy	28
8.	Financial Implications	34
9.	DPE Implementation Programme	35
10.	Recommended Tariff changes	37
11.	Summary of Proposals	39

Appendices:

1:	Car Park survey data (see related media to right of web page)	41
	On Street parking surveys	42/a/1
	Short/medium stay surveys	42/b/1 – 14
	Long stay (Yeovil) surveys	42/c/1 – 5
	Long stay (Excl. Yeovil) surveys	42/d/1 - 13
2:	Details of Demand projections	43
3:	Results of tariff modelling	48
4:	De-Criminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE)	62
5:	Study Brief	73
6:	Existing tariffs	76
7:	Car Park Location Maps (see related media to right of web page)	78

1. Background

1.1 The Project Centre (PCL) was commissioned by South Somerset District Council (SSDC) in September 2005. Expected outcomes of the study were:

1. The current patterns and trends in parking. This will require an establishment of demand and supply at present for public parking both on and off street.
2. Quantification of how demand will evolve up to 2016 i.e. projection of future demand and supply.
3. Develop a modelling tool to operate at different objective scenarios to enable the authority to establish the balanced strategy it seeks. In particular to test a range of car parking supply and charges and run the modelling to evaluate the practicality of the main policy objectives.
4. To identify potential for influencing and achieving modal shift away from the car towards more sustainable transport modes, including public transport, thereby enabling greater choice.
5. To evaluate the practicality of Park & Ride in Yeovil by 2016. (Starting from a recent Park & Ride feasibility study that indicated Park & Ride was not currently viable)
6. To establish the elasticities of demand and how car parking charges impact on that, taking car parking costs into account and establishing a maximum car parking revenue.
7. To identify those Car Park sites in Areas East, West & North with potential for decking and/or development and how demand, as assessed within outputs 2 & 3 above, can be met to replace any sites where the priority is determined as redevelopment rather than parking. (This work is already evolving in Area South through the Yeovil Urban Development Framework).
8. The enforcement regime necessary (type of on street restriction and the level and nature of actual enforcement) to achieve the provisional objectives of the emerging Strategy and in particular objective 6 (see Appendix 5- Study Brief).
9. Ensure the reasonable competitiveness of our car parking charges.

The full study brief is attached in Appendix 5 to this report.

1.2 The work is being carried out in three phases, data collection, data analysis and option development.

1.3 This report covers all phases and is divided into sections covering Data collection; Survey analysis; Demand profiles; Supply-Demand comparisons; Options to address imbalances, draft Parking Strategy, Recommended Tariff Changes and Financial implications.

2. Data Collection

2.1 The collection of data relating to on and off street parking demand pressure points, occupancy levels and duration of stay, need to be carried out in order to ascertain the parking characteristics of the area.

2.2 Part of the project involves the collection of data on the use of car parks located in Yeovil, Chard, Crewkerne, Ilminster, Wincanton, Bruton, Castle Cary, Langport, Martock, Somerton and South Petherton.

2.3 The data was collected continuously between 9am and 6pm on days agreed with the Council. Part of the Reg No. of all vehicles that enter or exit each car park point was collected, along with the time (in hours and minutes) and the classification of the vehicle. We also noted blue badge holders with a view to commenting on disabled parking bay provision. The data at each car park was collected manually using pen and paper or directly onto dictaphones, with subsequent transcription. The method of data collection was dependant on the expected volume and frequency of vehicles.

2.4 Project Centre carried out occupancy surveys in the roads in the town centres indicated above as designated in the local plan. The surveys comprised a manual count of the vehicles in each road at that specific time. The maximum usable space was also calculated (discounting existing parking restriction dropped kerbs and a standard 18.29m junction clearance where no parking restriction exist.

2.5 This information will inform the necessary demand and supply trends in the towns. Fuller details of the data collected are in Appendix 1.

3. Survey Analysis

3.1 This section provides a summary and commentary on the parking survey results off and on street that are set out location by location in Appendix 1. It gives a general picture of parking usage for each town but is not a substitute for the individual results.

3.2 The varied nature of the District means that no general conclusions can be drawn about parking behaviour. This is not surprising, given the differing roles and catchments that the settlements serve. **The limiting resources for survey meant that only a snapshot could be taken in order to provide an illustrative base on which to make comparisons with the future demand projections.** The survey results were checked against ticket audits and by the use of further manual and automatic counts.

Off Street

3.3 Each of the eleven settlements is dealt with individually followed by a summary Table. The assignment of type of stay within the SSDC consolidated Car Parking Order appears inconsistent and could be clarified. Generally 'short' is used for stays up to 2 hours, maximum, 'medium' stays up to half a day (3 or 4 hours) and 'long' greater than half a day. This is dealt with in more detail in the section of the study on tariffs and controls.

Bruton

3.4 The three car parks in Bruton are all small, free and effectively unrestricted as controls on duration of stay are 12 hours or greater. They were all heavily used throughout the survey day. Total capacity is 44 spaces with less than 10% available at the busiest time on the survey.

Castle Cary

3.5 The two car parks in Castle Cary differ in size and use. Millbrook Gardens is medium sized, well used and has allocated space for coach drop off and pick up. St Catherine's Close is small and less well used. Both car parks are free and permit durations not exceeding 12 hours. Maximum occupancy is 80% plus.

Chard

3.6 The three short/medium car parks are all well used but with some unused capacity throughout the surveyed day. The four medium/long stay car parks vary in their use with a surveyed maximum of between half to three-quarters full.

Crewkerne

3.7 The one short stay car park in South Street has a good turnover and was full during the surveyed morning, some space being available later in the day. The two medium/long car parks are heavily used with limited space available at any time.

Iminster

3.8 All three car parks are 'medium/long' stay. Pattern of use are maximum occupancy in the mid to high 80%^s, and is skewed to the morning with more capacity being available in the afternoon.

Langport

3.9 Both free car parks are well used with limited space (15%) available throughout the surveyed day. Use of the designated area for 2 hour maximum stay was not specifically surveyed.

Martock

3.10 The single free car park at North Street has a maximum stay of 12 hours and is well used but with space available on the survey day.

Somerton

3.11 Although all three car parks are free, the Order designates six 2-hour maximum bays in Half Moon and an overall 12 hour maximum stay in both Paddock House and Half Moon. The Unicorn car park allows durations up to 3 hours. All are well used with some spare capacity on the survey day except late morning at Paddock House.

South Petherton

3.12 The two free car parks at Prigg Lane and ST. James are well used throughout the day but there was always space available on the survey day.

Wincanton

3.13 All three car parks have a maximum permitted stay of 24 hours or greater. Their use varies with Church Fields and the eastern part of Memorial Hall being heavily used through the day; space being always available in Memorial Hall (western part). Carrington Way is heavily used during the morning and has a section designated for short stay only.

Yeovil

3.14 The multiplicity of sites, varied tariffs, commercial competition and convenience of location mean that a generalised commentary is not appropriate.

3.15 The five short stay car parks (Newton Road, Park Street, Peter Street, South Street and South St [old market]), four of which have a maximum stay of only one hour, are all heavily used throughout the day often with cars waiting for space and a high turnover per space.

3.16 Similarly, four of the five medium stay car parks (Box Factory, Court Ash, North Lane, Petters Way and West Hendford) are heavily used, the exception being the Box Factory. Again, turnover per space is good albeit with lower values than for the short stay. Pressure for space eased during the afternoon.

3.17 The three Medium/Long stay car parks (Earle Street, Golden Stones and Stars Lane West) are all well used throughout the day with 5-10% space available generally.

3.18 There are seven long stay locations (Brunswick Street, Fairfield, Goldcroft, Huish, Huish Old Pool, Market Street and Mill Lane). Five are heavily used with little or no space available until the late afternoon. There is generally space available at Mill Lane and Huish Old Pool (also known as Queensway Place) although the latter is reserved for season ticket holders.

Table 3.1- Summary of usage of off-street car parks

Where occupancy is indicated at >100%, this is a result of cars circulating looking for space, parking in unmarked areas and the hourly summing of vehicles in and out

Town	Area	Car Park	Type	Capacity: Spaces	Turn-Over	Max. Occ. %
Bruton	East	Higher Backway	F	15	n/a	100
		Packhorse Bridge	F	8	n/a	88
		Tolbury Mill	F	21	n/a	90
Castle Cary	East	Millbrook Gdns	F	91	n/a	86
		St Catherine's Cl	F	35	n/a	80
Chard	West	Bath Street	S	126	3.60	49
		Boden Street	M	66	2.58	53
		Combe Street	M/L	29	n/a	86
		Crowshute	L	72	n/a	44
		Essex Close	S	102	3.99	43
		Market Fields	M/L	77	n/a	62
		The Minnows	M/L	40	n/a	60
Crewkerne	West	Abbey Street	M/L	55	n/a	95
		South Street	S	271	5.88*	105*
		West Street	M/L	67	n/a	78
Ilminster	West	Orchard Vale	M/L	58	n/a	88
		Shudrick Lane	M/L	150"	n/a	86
		West Street	L	41	n/a	90
Langport	Nth	Cocklemoor (N&S) [Whatley]	F	190	n/a	84
		Stacy's Court	F	26	n/a	85
Martock	Nth	North Street (2)	F	72	n/a	69
Somerton	Nth	Half Moon	F	46	n/a	70
		Paddock Hse (1)	F	56	n/a	95
		Unicorn (1)	F	55	n/a	80

Town	Area	Car Park	Type	Capacity: Spaces	Turn-Over/ space	Max. Occup. %
S Petherton	Nth	Prigg Lane	F	39	n/a	79
		St. James St (4)	F	66	n/a	79
Wincanton	East	Carrington Wy (3)	F	100	n/a	94
		Churchfields	F	40	n/a	95
		Memorial Hall (E&W)	F	136	n/a	87
Yeovil	Sth	Box Factory	M	128	1.72	43
		Brunswick Street	L	60	n/a	93
		Court Ash	M	106	3.59	109
		Earle Street	M/L	67	n/a	94
		Fairfield	L	91	n/a	100
		Goldcroft	L	109	n/a	97
		Golden Stones	M/L	144	n/a	86
		Huish	L	223	n/a	100
		Huish Old Pool~ (Queensway Pl)	L	79	n/a	43
		Market Street	L	29	n/a	100
		Mill Lane	L	88	n/a	92
		Newton Road	S	16	6.25	81
		North Lane	M	52	5.21	148
		Park Street	S	15	6.87	133
		Peter Street	S	23	10.87	148
		Petters Way	M	213	3.23	92
		South Street	S	29	6.72	37
		South St (Old Market)	S	45	8.60	115
		Stars Lane West	M/L	202	n/a	92
		West Hendford	M	169	3.79	86

- S Short stay Variety of 1, 2, 3 or 4 hour max
M Medium stay 3 or 4 hour max
M/L Medium/Long stay 3 or 4 hour max and all day
L Long stay All day
~ Season holders only
“ Estimated, bays not marked
(1) Owned by SSDC, leased to Town Council
(2) Leased by Co-op to SSDC
(3) Owned by County Council
(4) Owned by S Petherton Parish Council
* See comments in paragraph 5.11 re. private car parking

On Street

3.19 Below are comments on results for the individual settlements. Fuller details of all the quoted figures and a breakdown of vehicles parked on the restrictions can be found in **Appendix 1** of this report. Areas surveyed were those designated as town centres in the local plan. The lengths of parallel and 90 degree parking are unrestricted (i.e. absence of doctor bays, loading bay and bus stops). Some of the available on street provision will have percentage occupancies in excess of 100%. The manner in which Project Centre has devised the actual amount of spaces is to divide the available parking space by 5.5 for parallel parking and 2 for the 90 degree parking. In some instances more vehicles have been able to park in the parallel or 90 degree parking provision than the stipulated number available due to parking bumper-to-bumper, cars smaller than 5.5 metres using the spaces or a combination of both.

Bruton

3.20 Bruton has 1.1km of kerbside length of which 429 metres is parallel parking space. There is no 90 degree parking in the town centre area. This figure equates to 38.82% of the total kerbside length, which is the highest percentage of kerb length given over to parking.

3.21 At the time the survey was carried out 35 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces. This equates an occupancy level of 40%.

Castle Cary

3.22 Castle Cary has 946 metres of kerbside length of which 269 metres is parallel parking space and 40 metres is used as 90 degree parking. These figures equate to 28.44% and 4.23% respectively of the total kerbside length.

3.23 At the time the survey was carried out 45 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces and 14 in the 90 degree parking spaces. This equates to occupancy levels of 81% for the parallel parking and 101% for the 90 degree parking.

Chard

3.24 Chard, in terms of total kerbside space, is the second largest of the surveyed areas with just over 2.3km of kerbside length. There was a measured length of 462 metres of parallel parking space and 21 metres of 90 degree parking which equates to 19.92% and 0.91% respectively of the total kerbside length. As a comparison the parallel parking length is only 14 metres less than Yeovil whereas Yeovil has approximately 4 times the kerbside space.

3.25 At the time the survey was carried out 64 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces and 8 in the 90 degree parking spaces which equates

to occupancy levels of 69% and 106% respectively. Chard is the only area where a coach was witnessed parking on street.

Crewkerne

3.26 Crewkerne has 1.21km of kerbside length of which 175 metres is parallel parking space and 12 metres is used as 90 degree parking. These figures equate to 14.3% and 0.98% respectively of the total kerbside length. The area shown as Market Square car park on the Crewkerne Map (Appendix 6) has been included within the on-street provision.

3.27 At the time the survey was carried out 24 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces and 5 in the 90 degree parking spaces. This equates to occupancy levels of 75.5% for the parallel parking and 83% for the 90 degree parking. Overall this area has good occupancy levels. The generally accepted level of optimum occupancy is considered to be 85%. Crewkerne would appear to be able to cater for those wishing to make use of the on street parking facilities and has occupancy levels, which are reflective of a town centre.

Iminster

3.28 Iminster has 869 metres of kerbside length of which 285 metres is parallel parking space and 37 metres is used as 90 degree parking. These figures equate to 32.8% and 4.26% respectively of the total kerbside length.

3.29 At the time the survey was carried out 44 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces and 15 in the 90 degree parking spaces. This equates to occupancy levels of 77% for the parallel parking and 113% for the 90 degree parking.

Langport

3.30 Langport has 806 metres of kerbside length of which 76 metres is parallel parking space. There is no 90 degree parking in the town centre area. This figure equates to 9.43% of the total kerbside length.

3.31 At the time the survey was carried out 8 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces. This equates an occupancy level of 52%.

Martock

3.32 With only 319 metres of kerbside length Martock is the smallest of the surveyed area. 106 metres is used for parallel parking space. There is no 90 degree parking in the town centre area. This figure equates to 29.2% of the total kerbside length.

3.33 At the time the survey was carried out 35 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces. This equates an occupancy level of 66%.

Somerton

3.34 Somerton has 1.01km of which 149 metres is parallel parking space and 180 metres is used as 90 degree parking. The 90 degree parking percentage is the highest percentage of all the areas surveyed. These figures equate to 14.64% and 17.68% respectively of the total kerbside length.

3.35 At the time the survey was carried out 13 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces and 63 in the 90 degree parking spaces. This equates to occupancy levels of 43% for the parallel parking and 98% for the 90 degree parking.

South Petherton

3.36 South Petherton, with 507 metres of kerbside length, is the second smallest of the areas surveyed. 148 metres is parallel parking space and 9 metres is used as 90 degree parking. These figures equate to 29.19% and 1.78% respectively of the total kerbside length.

3.37 At the time the survey was carried out 20 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces and 4 in the 90 degree parking spaces. This equates to occupancy levels of 67% for the parallel parking. The fact that no vehicles were witnessed parked on the existing restrictions (which make up 69% of the total available kerbside space) is reflective of the low occupancy levels in South Petherton.

Wincanton

3.38 Wincanton has 997 metres of kerbside length of which 66 metres is parallel parking space. This figure equates to 6.62% of the total kerbside length. There is no 90 degree parking in the town centre area.

3.39 At the time the survey was carried out 12 vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces. This equates an occupancy level of 90%.

Yeovil

3.40 Yeovil, in terms of total kerbside space, is 4 times larger than any other of the surveyed areas with just over 10km of kerbside length. There was a measured length of 476 metres of parallel parking space and 153 metres of 90 degree parking which equates to only 4.73% and 1.52% respectively of the total kerbside length. This is reflective of many factors such as road width, junction capacity retention and the need to secure free and unhindered movement of traffic.

3.41 Unsurprisingly the high percentage of restrictions in the town centre (9.4km or 93% of total kerbside length) has led to over notional parking. At the time the survey was carried out 102 (118%) vehicles were parked in the parallel parking spaces and 54 (70%) in the 90 degree parking spaces.

4. Demand Profiles

Introduction

4.1 This section seeks to establish future demand up to the year 2016. It includes various profiles based on a range of possible changes in the travel patterns in the District. Definitive forecasting of traffic levels is notoriously problematic, being influenced by factors that cannot be controlled or anticipated. Examples of this are the state of the economy, oil prices and public perceptions of risk.

4.2 Despite this, there is general acceptance by government, lobby groups and the transport industry that certain trends are well established and unlikely to change significantly without an unexpected catastrophic event. These trends are the continued increase in car ownership and the public's expectation that their personal mobility will continue to improve.

4.3 Appendix 2 comprises the development of a series of profiles showing a number of potential changes to travel patterns and the related Tables. As appropriate these are shown for the whole District and for some individual towns. Also included are comparisons with the TEMPRO data set and outputs from the SATURN modelling of Yeovil. Table 4.1 below shows the summary of these projections that is taken forward to the subsequent possible scenarios that have been derived to represent realistic likely traffic and parking demand:

4.4 These projected increases and effects are not absolute but have reasonable confidence levels and are appropriate for this study. It will be essential that the actual changes are monitored regularly and carefully to ensure that decisions flowing from any agreed strategy are taken using the most up to date data. The numbering for Table 4.1 below is repeated here for clarification:

2. Base + Housing planned development in SSDC
3. Base + Housing + national traffic growth at 1%
4. Base + Housing + national traffic growth at 1.5%
5. Base + Housing + national traffic growth at 1%-modal shift 5% in SSDC
6. Base + Housing + national traffic growth at 1%- modal shift 10%
- 6A. As 6 but 5% modal shift in 2008, then 10% by 2010

(1 is existing)

Table 4.1: Combined travel pattern changes (also Table A2.3 in Appendix 2)

Year	2	3	4	5	6	6A
2006	101.1	102.1	102.6	102.1	102.1	102.1
2007	102.7	104.8	105.8	104.8	104.8	104.8
2008	104.1	107.2	108.8	107.2	107.2	107.2
2009	105.5	109.7	111.8	109.7	109.7	101.8
2010	106.8	112.1	114.8	112.1	112.1	102.8
2011	107.6	114.1	117.3	114.1	114.1	97.7
2012	108.0	115.6	119.3	108.4	103.1	98.6
2013	108.3	117.0	121.3	109.4	104.5	99.4
2014	108.7	118.5	123.4	110.5	105.9	100.3
2015	109.1	120.0	125.5	111.5	107.4	101.2
2016	109.5	121.5	127.6	112.6	108.9	102.1

Application of Demand Profiles

4.5 The above demand profiles have been derived for the district as a whole. Given the varying characteristics of the major and minor settlements within the scope of the study this section sets out a hierarchy that will determine appropriate combinations of travel patterns to be applied as part of the supply demand comparisons.

4.6 The hierarchy is based on a range of factors already covered in the Yeovil Transport Study Review, South Somerset Yeovil Retail Study and public transport and other information supplied by officers. It seeks to recognise the role of parking within wider strategies and the likelihood or not of the changes profiled. The suggested hierarchy is:

- A: Major centre with strategic impact, most significant and best in District bus network, rail links and major development pressures **Yeovil**
- B: Major centre with reasonable bus network, (and a rail link [Crewkerne]) and strong development pressures **Chard, Crewkerne**
- C: Local centre with local link bus network, some planned developments **Ilminster, Wincanton**
- D: Smaller centres with limited bus or rail links, often less than everyday **Bruton, Castle Cary, Langport, Martock, Somerton, South Petherton**

4.7 Category A is the only one where it is likely that practicable, affordable initiatives can be taken that will achieve the higher level of modal shift (10%). There is also the number and scale of parking provision and potential which could allow a revised management regime and controlled release of certain sites for development within a co-ordinated strategy.

4.8 Towns in Category B have the public transport networks that could support a small modal shift from largely voluntary measures. Development pressures and the related loss of capacity will have to be addressed by a combination of more effective management with replacement facilities where

possible. Changes in cultural attitudes could increase the level of modal shift although this is not likely to exceed 5%.

4.9 There should be some limited opportunities in Categories C and D to manage the parking stock more effectively; it is unlikely that even with higher public transport take up following voluntary initiatives there would be sufficient modal shift to significantly address growth in demand.

4.10 Across the District the topography, trip purpose and current culture mean that the possibility for walking or cycling to make a noticeable contribution to modal shift is minimal. Although SSDC, the County and public transport operators are making significant and successful efforts to improve the networks and patronage for the reasons outlined above this is unlikely to deliver more than a small percentage modal shift except in Yeovil where there are opportunities to combine these efforts with other controls and initiatives.

Matrix of possible demand profiles

4.11 This Table shows the demand profiles selected to provide the projections for individual settlements to inform the supply-demand comparisons:

Numbering is as in Table 4.1 above, namely:

2. Base + Housing planned development in SSDC
3. Base + Housing + national traffic growth at 1%
4. Base + Housing + national traffic growth at 1.5%
5. Base+Housing+national traffic growth at 1%-modal shift 5% in SSDC
6. Base+Housing+national traffic growth at 1%-modal shift 10% in SSDC
- 6A. As 6 but 5% modal shift in 2008, then 10% by 2010

Table 4.2 - Matrix of options and settlements

Town/ Profile	2	3	4	5	6	6A
A: Yeovil	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
B: Chard, Crewkerne	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
C: Ilminster, Wincanton	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
D: Bruton, Castle Cary, Langport, Martock, Somerton, S Petherton	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N

4.12 It is considered that this approach is appropriate to the centre concerned, but it would be possible to change the assigned profiles or to generate additional ones depending on circumstance.

5. Demand-Supply Comparisons

5.1 This section sets out the demand that has been projected for each settlement and compares it with current demand and supply to identify where capacity could be exceeded. In addition, known or anticipated changes in capacity resulting from re-development, are included as these, in general, increase the pressure on supply.

5.2 During the period of the study there have been various changes and updated information on developments, whether under discussion or the subject of an application. This is inevitable and wherever possible the work has been updated, but the caution is that even more uncertainties have been introduced. During preparation of this revised draft further information on possible residential developments and an application for a Lidl supermarket in Wincanton became available but these have not been included.

5.3 As noted earlier, the surveys were only carried out on one day in a neutral month that is representative of average conditions. At other times of the week and year current, and therefore future, demand will be greater or less for a variety of reasons. These include:

- **School holidays (higher or lower)**
- **Saturdays (higher generally)**
- **Market days (higher)**
- **Christmas period (much higher)**

5.4 Over time recommended work will refine and quantify these differences but for the purpose of this study the comparisons made represent an illustration and at times of the week and in the run up to Christmas, demand will be greater and any identified deficits will be worsened.

5.5 To illustrate the potential pressure so that options and priorities can be identified and for summary comparative purposes a single time of 11.00 AM is used to sum existing demand. This reflects the indicative overall pattern across the District (and in general, nationally) that short and medium stay car parks' maximum occupancy is mid-to-late morning. Also, to avoid reams of tables that do not add to the development of the strategy and action plans, existing is compared with the end of 2011 and 2016, as mid-point and final points for the projection timescale respectively. The profile 6A for earlier timescale for achieving modal shift is also omitted for clarity.

5.6 Future maximum occupancy is capped at 95% to allow for differential arrivals and departures, circulation and varying demand between car parks. This is shown as 'Average maximum usage' in the profiles.

5.7 Bruton

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	41	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	43					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand	N/A	44	47	48	44	
Average max. usage	N/A	41	41	41	41	
Surplus/(Deficit)		(3)	(6)	(7)	(3)	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand	N/A	45	50	52	46	
Average max. usage	N/A	41	41	41	41	
Surplus/(Deficit)		(4)	(9)	(11)	(5)	

5.8 Castle Cary

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	106	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	126					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand	N/A	114	120	124	115	
Average max. usage	N/A	120	120	120	120	
Surplus/(Deficit)		6	0	(4)	5	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand	N/A	116	129	135	119	
Average max. usage	N/A	120	120	120	120	
Surplus/(Deficit)		4	(9)	(15)	1	

5.9 Chard

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	324	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Capacity	512					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	1.031
Demand	N/A	349	370	380	351	334
Average max. usage	N/A	486	486	486	486	486
Surplus/(Deficit)		137	116	106	135	152
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	1.089
Demand	N/A	355	394	413	365	353
Average max. usage	N/A	486	486	486	486	486
Surplus/(Deficit)		131	92	73	121	133

5.10 Chard development pressures on car park capacity

The development changes shown relate to the loss of Boden Street and Market Fields car parks (143 spaces) with replacement capacity of 50 spaces.

The location of the latter will be associated with re-development and for profiling purposes the mix and pattern of short, medium and long stay parking does not alter across the town.

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Base year demand	324					
Development-2011:	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	1.031
Demand	N/A	349	370	380	351	334
Capacity (419)	N/A	398	398	398	398	398
Surplus/(Deficit)	N/A	49	28	18	47	64
Development-2016:	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	1.089
Demand	N/A	355	394	413	365	353
Capacity (419)	N/A	398	398	398	398	398
Surplus/(Deficit)	N/A	43	4	(15)	33	45

5.11 Crewkerne

The layout of the area surrounding the South Street car park is complicated, with four private sections whose sole access is shared with the public car parking area. The capacity of the private sections is of the order of 70, but even if unused these spaces are not available to the public. The survey logged all cars and vans entering and leaving at a point on the access road by the entry point to the car parks. As a result, the number of spaces in the private sections is included. Additional observations on Wednesday 23rd May at the car park at 11 AM indicated only 5-10 spaces available in the public area, effectively making the car park full. **Therefore, for the purposes of applying the projections, the assumption is made that at the comparative reference time of 11AM there is an occupancy rate of 95% in the public car park.**

	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	361*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Capacity	393					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	1.031
Demand	N/A	388	412	423	391	372
Average max. usage	N/A	373	373	373	373	373
Surplus/(Deficit)		(15)	(39)	(50)	(18)	1
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	1.089
Demand	N/A	395	439	461	406	393
Average max. usage	N/A	373	373	373	373	373
Surplus/(Deficit)		(22)	(66)	(88)	(33)	(20)

* Assumes 95% occupancy at South Street

5.12 Crewkerne development pressures on car park capacity

The development assumed here is the development of a Waitrose supermarket on part of the South Street car park. The effect on capacity of this is advised to be an increase of 96 spaces (304-208), The application draft Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) prepared by W S Atkins indicated 3000 vehicular trips per day of which 20% would be linked and 20% pass by. The draft TIA then tabulates arrivals and departures by time on a weekday and then derives from this parking accumulations (*Table 6.4 in the draft TIA*). The following values have been extracted from that Table to assess possible demand at 11 AM:

Parking Accumulations from the Waitrose development predicted in the TIA

Time	Arrivals	Departures	Accumulation
8-9	175	81	94
9-10	179	175	98
10-11	169	160	107
11-12	190	188	109
12-13	196	196	109

Extract from Table 6.4 in draft WS Atkins TIA

The leisure centre will also add to demand on the South Street car park. Here, the Gym will have 550+ members. The following calculation is intended to derive an indicative figure for demand at 11 AM.

Assumptions:

- 10% members attend gym on a weekday (=55)
- 20% of daily use is during morning (=11)
- 90% are non-linked trips (=10)
- All these members are car borne (=10)

This would produce an indicative parking demand of 10 vehicles.

This figure, added to that of 107 from the Waitrose TIA, gives a total additional base year parking demand at 11 AM of 117 vehicles.

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Base Year demand	478					
Development-2011:	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	1.031
Demand @ 11 AM	N/A	514	545	561	518	493
Capacity (489)	N/A	465	465	465	465	465
Surplus/(Deficit)	N/A	(49)	(80)	(96)	(53)	(28)
Development-2016:	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	1.089
Demand @ 11 AM	N/A	523	581	610	538	521
Capacity (489)	N/A	465	465	465	465	465
Surplus/(Deficit)	N/A	(58)	(116)	(145)	(73)	(56)

5.13 Ilminster

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	217	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	249					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand	N/A	233	248	255	235	
Average max. usage	N/A	237	237	237	237	
Surplus/(Deficit)		4	(11)	(18)	2	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand	N/A	238	264	277	244	
Average max. usage	N/A	237	237	237	237	
Surplus/(Deficit)		(1)	(27)	(40)	(7)	

5.14 Ilminster Development

Here the proposed development is a Tesco supermarket which is it is advised will generate 4500 vehicular trips per day of which 25% are assessed to be linked. The TIA was not available when drafting this section so the relevant factors from the Waitrose proposal were applied to the Tesco generated trips. The following calculation indicates the probable additional demand at 11 AM. The supermarket car park capacity is advised to be 215 spaces, compared to the existing capacity of 150, unmarked giving an indicative increase of 65 spaces.

SSDC have advised that:

“The lease on the Shrudrick Lane car park terminates on 21/06/06. There is an agreement, however, to stay on site until construction of the proposed Tesco store commences. Part of the new proposed store car park (60 spaces) will also be available during the construction of the store.

Whilst Tesco will manage the store car park the section 106 agreement provides that this car park ‘will be available to persons using or visiting retail and other facilities within Ilminster Town Centre’ ”.

Since it will clearly have an impact on the projections for Ilminster this car park has been factored into the Demand-Supply comparisons for Ilminster.”

Assumptions:

- 4500 trips per day
- Pattern of arrivals and departures as for Waitrose development at Crewkerne
- 25% are linked therefore 75% are new (=3375)
- Ratio to be applied to Waitrose parking accumulation table is 3375/2800 (=1.205)

Parking Accumulations for Tesco development

Time	Arrivals	Departures	Accumulation
8-9	211	98	113
9-10	216	211	118
10-11	204	193	129
11-12	229	227	131
12-13	276	276	131

Ilminster profile with development

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand at 11 AM	346	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	314					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand at 11 AM	N/A	372	395	406	375	
Average max. usage	N/A	298	298	298	298	
Surplus/(Deficit)		(74)	(97)	(107)	(77)	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand at 11 AM	N/A	379	420	441	390	
Average max. usage	N/A	298	298	298	298	
Surplus/(Deficit)		(81)	(122)	(143)	(92)	

5.15 Langport

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	181	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	215					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand	N/A	195	207	212	196	
Average max. usage	N/A	204	204	204	204	
Surplus/(Deficit)		9	(3)	(8)	8	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand	N/A	198	220	230	204	
Average max. usage	N/A	204	204	204	204	
Surplus/(Deficit)		6	(16)	(26)	0	

5.16 Martock

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	69					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand	N/A	54	57	59	54	
Average max. usage	N/A	66	66	66	66	
Surplus/(Deficit)		12	9	7	15	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand	N/A	55	61	64	56	
Average max. usage	N/A	66	66	66	66	
Surplus/(Deficit)		11	5	2	10	

5.17 Somerton

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	129	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	157					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand	N/A	139	147	151	140	
Average max. usage	N/A	149	149	149	149	
Surplus/(Deficit)		10	2	(2)	9	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand	N/A	141	157	165	145	
Average max. usage	N/A	149	149	149	149	
Surplus/(Deficit)		8	(8)	(16)	4	

5.18 South Petherton

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	77	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	97					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand	N/A	82	88	90	83	
Average max. usage	N/A	92	92	92	92	
Surplus/(Deficit)		10	4	2	9	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand	N/A	84	94	98	87	
Average max. usage	N/A	92	92	92	92	
Surplus/(Deficit)		8	(2)	(6)	5	

5.19 Wincanton

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	250	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Capacity	276					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	
Demand	N/A	269	285	293	271	
Average max. usage	N/A	262	262	262	262	
Surplus/(Deficit)		(7)	(23)	(31)	(9)	
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	
Demand	N/A	274	304	319	281	
Average max. usage	N/A	262	262	262	262	
Surplus/(Deficit)		(12)	(42)	(57)	(19)	

5.20 Yeovil

Profile/Impact	Ex.	2	3	4	5	6
Demand	1658	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Capacity "	1890					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	1.031
Demand	N/A	1784	1892	1945	1797	1709
Average max. usage	N/A	1796	1796	1796	1796	1796
Surplus/(Deficit)		12	(96)	(149)	(1)	87
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	1.089
Demand	N/A	1816	2015	2116	1867	1806
Average max. usage	N/A	1796	1796	1796	1796	1796
Surplus/(Deficit)		(20)	(219)	(320)	(71)	(10)

" Excludes Quedam, Yeo Leisure, Tesco and Yeovil District Hospital car parks

Yeovil development pressures on car park capacity

5.21 There is a range of potential development pressures in Yeovil. The Yeovil Urban Development Framework (UDF) examines opportunities for several sites to be developed and some of these include all or part of several car parks. Given the strategic nature of the UDF outcomes may differ but as an illustration the parking summary of proposals set out on **Page 91 of the UDF** has been used in the profile below.

5.22 Also, the UDF identifies decking at Petters Way and Star Lane West (Urban Village) as a means of mitigating the loss of capacity. Decking is dealt with later in the options section but the specific figures in the UDF summary are included in the profile below.

5.23 If the development opportunities described in the UDF were all implemented together with the matched alternative capacity then potential loss of supply will be addressed but the whole framework must be progressed. There may also be additional demand arising from the success of

the framework itself in attracting retailers and their customers. could be exacerbated.

5.24 It is possible that retail growth in Yeovil (and possibly elsewhere in the district) may exceed that directly associated with the factors included within the forecasts. This 'retail drift' will increase unrestrained demand on parking and could also result in car park sites themselves coming under consideration for development. Initial discussion with SSSDC and County officers has not identified a simple means of allowing for such drift. So an assumed percentage may have to be used. Whatever the conclusion on how to profile this issue, any such drift will serve to increase other pressures on parking capacity. The development of the Area Action Plan over the next 8-9 months will examine and define this issue.

Yeovil development profile based on UDF proposals

Profile/Impact		2	3	4	5	6
Anticipated Capacity "	2091*					
2011: Factor	N/A	1.076	1.141	1.173	1.084	1.031
Demand	N/A	1784	1892	1945	1797	1709
Average max. usage	N/A	1986	1986	1986	1986	1986
Surplus/(Deficit)		202	94	41	189	277
2016: Factor	N/A	1.095	1.215	1.276	1.126	1.089
Demand	N/A	1816	2015	2116	1867	1806
Average max. usage	N/A	1986	1986	1986	1986	1986
Surplus/(Deficit)		170	(29)	(130)	119	180

* Based on existing SSSDC capacity of 1890

Less: Court Ash	61	Plus: Petters Way	106
North Lane	51	Queensway Ave	112
South Street	31	Reckleford Ave	50
Stars Lane W	203	Urban village	180
Foundry Hse**	88	Cattle Market	235
Fairfield	46		
	480		683

**Foundry House relates to the Mill Lane car park for which a capacity of 88 has been used, not the 128 quoted in the UDF.

“ Excludes Quedam, Yeo Leisure, Tesco and Yeovil District Hospital car parks but includes all changes set out on Page 91 of the UDF, ie loss through re-development, decking and new provision.

6. Options to address imbalances

6.1 This section sets out a number of options which could be part of an action plan to deliver the parking strategy. They are primarily intended to address demand and supply issues: several are part of existing good management but can be targeted to redress imbalances. It should be noted that the ability of the District Council to influence and change travel patterns and behaviour through parking management is constrained by its control of the parking stock. It is the Project Centre's view that whatever pressures applied by developers or communities to change the current level of control these should be resisted by the Council.

6.2 Generally, the options are not inter-dependent but some are more suited to particular circumstances and locations. This aspect is summarised in a draft action matrix at the end of the section.

6.3 The options fall into three broad groupings: maximising existing capacity (A), adding capacity (B) and reducing demand (C). Each has a number of components.

A: Maximising Existing Capacity

6.4 There are three components in this section, review of existing layout, changes to tariffs and alternative management arrangements.

Review of existing layout

6.5 This option seeks to review each car park to determine if there are any opportunities to revise access, circulation or bay layout to increase capacity. At certain locations there may be the possibility of relocating the mini-recycling centre to release additional space.

6.6 The demand profiles show that for certain settlements the imbalance is small both in percentage and absolute numbers so such a review could meet increased demand by this option alone.

6.7 Given its simplicity, that the review and any consequential works can be phased, and that it does not interact or depend on any other option, it is recommended that this option be adopted.

Tariff changes

6.8 Detailed assessment of the potential effects of tariff changes on existing charge structures and different user groups has been modelled as part of phase 3 of the study and the results are included as Appendix 3 This section gives a general view on the opportunities this option could offer.

6.9 As reported in other studies modest increases in tariffs do not have any effect on usage and thus on economic and community activity. Modest is not defined but would currently be considered to be between inflation and 10%. At

higher levels (15-20%) increases can result in temporary reduced use and/or income which usually recovers within six months. At higher levels in certain circumstances there could be a permanent loss of patronage. The work carried out by the Town and Parish Councils in 2005 provides confirmation of this pattern of impact.

6.10 For car parks or limited waiting that is free of charge, again there is no evidence that the introduction of charges at a modest level does not result in a loss of use, although there may be initial resistance. Any impact can be mitigated by the shape of the tariff including options to have an initial free period.

6.11 Tariff structures and their appropriateness are extremely important in managing parking provision and its contribution to wider transport strategies. They can be instrumental in matching supply to demand by controlling durations and turnover, deterring or preventing certain user groups such as commuters or making specific provision for categories such as local workers. Also, and this may be relevant in certain of the SSDC's settlements, they can be used to re-direct users so that demand on capacity is more evenly distributed.

Alternative management arrangements

6.12 Any suggested management changes would flow from the review of tariffs and controls. They could include investment of increased income in more user-friendly and flexible payment methods, pay on exit and pay on foot, charging on certain days or times only and division of car parks to designate areas for specific user groups.

B: Additional capacity

6.13 In addition to benefits from the review of existing car park layouts and circulation (6.5 above) there are four main methods of creating additional capacity; new sites, car park extensions, decking and on-street permitted parking.

New sites

6.14 Costly, may not be a priority use for scarce development land, but a straightforward means of adding spaces. Could be an opportunity benefit of other large developments.

Car park extensions

6.15 Same issues regarding land availability and competing uses but utilises existing access, circulation and controls so cost per additional space is slightly lower.

Decking

6.16 Not generally suitable for car parks with capacity of less than say 100, because of disproportionate space for ramps and access and fixed costs. An exception can be where the decking is an integral part of a wider development to enable operational parking to be available to the public at certain times such as evenings and Saturdays. Also visual and other environmental impacts may be unacceptable. Topography can greatly assist the practicality and reduce costs.

6.17 Designs range from a basic steel frame, which can be partially screened and mitigated by brick cladding and landscaping to additional levels with architectural features and more sensitive integration with the surrounding environment. This option has already been identified within the Yeovil UDF as a means of replacing lost capacity.

6.18 A more expensive version of decking would be to build a multi-storey car park on an existing site, either with all levels above ground or some at lower levels.

6.19 The Yeovil UDF identifies Petters Way and Star Lane as potential candidates, if not redeveloped or in conjunction with such a change, the lowest section of the Box Factory could also be a possibility. Elsewhere, Carrington Way at Wincanton and Crowshute at Chard are potential candidates and could be considered if demand warrants.

On-street permitted parking

6.20 Here, probably in conjunction with De-criminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) existing limited waiting spaces are converted to paid-for spaces and additional bays introduced where possible. The current priority afforded to enforcement probably results in abuse of limited waiting and thus the loss of turnover and available capacity. The general intent and requirements for DPE are covered in detail in Appendix 4.

C: Reduction in demand

6.21 Reduction in demand here refers specifically to demand for parking within a settlement. It will be a key objective of any measures under this category to achieve this reduction with minimal adverse effect on the attractiveness of a destination or patronage.

6.22 Essentially this option relates to modal shift from car to public transport. For the reasons set out above it is unlikely that walking or cycling would be able to contribute significantly, notwithstanding the health and environmental benefits that will accrue from the current programme of improvements to pedestrian and cycling networks. The modal shift does not need to be for the whole trip, merely for the trip end where a reduction in parking demand is sought.

6.23 Measures fall into one of two types, development and promotion of alternatives often referred to as 'soft' methods and demand management where infrastructure, controls and/or fiscal measures are used to influence or deter motorists from using their cars. Both types contain passive and pro-active elements. These two types can be combined and the latter can be targeted at particular, routes, times or user groups.

6.24 Examples of each type are given below as illustrations. Much work has already been carried out and success achieved. For the future pursuing these options together with others described above will become more important as a means of balancing supply to demand.

'Soft' measures

6.25 SSDC, working with the County, operators and other stakeholders are already developing and implementing a number of these measures. New and revised bus routes, including the 'Nippy' initiative, are being tailored to need, while retaining flexibility to assist economic viability. Even with publicity these are largely passive with the public becoming aware of the new opportunities and making judgements on their suitability for particular journeys.

6.26 Pro-active soft measures could include a campaign on encouraging and facilitating changed travel patterns and choices. The DfT research into smarter travel showed that such work covering personalised and green travel plans, smarter ways to combine trips, etc. could result in a modal shift of 2-6% in rural areas.

Infrastructure and control changes

6.27 Pro-active measure, not covered in this study, could comprise traffic management and or restraint via traffic signal and other controls, so that the motorist is deterred by delay and longer trip length. Also, fiscal measures such as congestion or road user charging, would be in this category, albeit that their proven performance, applicability and acceptability in SSDC are not envisaged within the timescale covered by the study.

6.28 Passive measure would include increasing tariffs so that costs of public transport are competitive and Park and Ride facilities. The latter would be combined with tariff changes to ensure that there was an economic attraction to Park and Ride and that net revenue costs were minimal.

6.29 A detailed study of various P&R models has been carried out within the YTSR. This work will be revisited by mid July to assess the case over the longer time period to 2016. Further work may then be necessary by SSDC to determine suitability and availability of sites.

7. Towards a Parking Strategy

7.1 Given the wish to use the steering and stakeholders groups to consider potential options for further development or to not proceed at this time no firm proposals are made in this phase of the study. The matrix below is presented to assist the discussion and is Project Centre's current view on those measures that may be appropriate for individual settlements. New sites and extensions have not been included as these should be seen as ad hoc opportunities, often linked to development proposals.

7.2 The Table now includes views and comments from the Steering group and forms input to the draft strategy framework set out later in this section. Further discussion and consultation will refine and prioritise the strategy's content.

Table 7.1: Matrix of potential options

Town/ Option	Review layouts	Tariffs	Alt Mgt	Deck -ing*	On street space	Bus route Dev't	Smart travel plans	Park and Ride
A: Yeovil	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y**	Y	Y	Y
B: Chard, Crewkerne	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y**	Y	Y	
C: Ilminster, Wincanton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y**	Y		
D: Bruton, Castle Cary, Langport, Martock, Somerton, S Petherton	Y	Y	Y		Y***	Y		

* Only at appropriate sites

** likely to be linked to DPE

*** linked to DPE and only relevant for settlements under pressure

Draft Parking Strategy

7.3 This part sets out the objectives of and framework for a District-wide parking strategy. Development and implementation of the finally agreed strategy will be informed by the study report, together with the consultation responses and other related policies.

Purpose of the strategy

7.4 A District wide car parking strategy should provide a framework of objectives within which an action plan is developed and kept under review to

manage the Council's parking stock to best meet the impact of car travel linked to the needs of the residential, business and employment communities.

Strategy Objectives

7.5 The key strategy objectives are to:

1. Offer car parking that is convenient, well maintained, secure and publicised;
2. Provide capacity that seeks to balance the competing demands of residents, workers and visitors;
3. Be consistent with national, regional and local planning policies;
4. Contribute to wider transport strategies relating to congestion, sustainability and the environment;
5. Use tariffs to control use by time, influence modal shift and better balance the comparative costs of car and public transport;
6. Provide income for maintenance and future Investment;
7. Recognise local conditions that warrant different approaches;
8. Introduce restraint only when matched by the provision of convenient, attractive alternatives;

Strategy Development

7.6 The development of a full detailed strategy will emerge over the next six months. It will address provision, control and management of the five main components of the parking stock:

- Public car parks controlled by SSDC;
- Public car parks controlled by others;
- On-street parking;
- Private non-residential parking;
- Parking standards for new development.

7.7 The study report and current work centres on the first three of these. The influence of the fourth and fifth over time will need to be considered, as the former undermines and distorts initiatives to encourage modal shift and the latter can fuel demand by being too generous or exacerbate pressure on capacity by displacement.

7.8 Background information, consultation and further monitoring will provide the information base from which detail proposals and programmes can be derived. These will include district, town and more local elements. The Table below provides an outline of an action plan drawing on the findings of the study report and indicating where the tools described in that report would contribute to the plan's implementation.

7.9 A series of recommendations were made in the Yeovil Transport Strategy Review (YTSR) and by the Yeovil Community Review of Transport (YCRT). These are not repeated here but should be included as an appendix

and each examined again as part of the strategy development. Views on Yeovil may be distinct to that town or may offer options for other locations.

7.10 The skeletal Action Plan below illustrates in Project Centre's view how the various tools available to the Council could further the objectives of the strategy and the Table cross-references the related objective numbers.

7.11 Following consultation on the study report and draft strategy the Council will need to prioritise the action items taking into consideration importance, achievability, practicality and affordability.

Table 7.2: Initial action plan

Action point	Related objectives	Mechanism	Action	Outcome
Monitor growth trends	2,3,4	Compare actual trends in use to profiles for each town	Define and conduct regular (annual) checks	Enables adjustment to profiles to meet requirements avoids over/under provision
Review of car park layouts	1,2	Survey all car parks	Amend layout and facility as appropriate	Meets small loss in capacity or demand increases
Tariff review	1,2, 4-8	Modelling and rationalisation	Assess model output	Manage capacity better, encourage modal shift
Alternative management	2, 6, 7	Review current arrangements	Develop tailored solutions for individual sites/towns	Better allocation and utilisation
New sites	2, 3	Identify and develop	Implement to meet pressure	Protects and secures required capacity
Extensions	2, 3	As above	As above	As above
Decking	2, 3	Identify and construct	As above	As above
Public transport development	3, 4, 7	Work with operators and others	Continue and enhance current initiatives	Contributes to modal shift and reduced parking demand
Smart travel plans	3, 4, 7	Publicity and campaign material	Deliver promotions, publicise and campaign	As above, plus spread of demand
Park and Ride	3, 4, 7, 8	Provide PnR sites and bus links	Review previous study	Reduced demand in Yeovil

Introduction of Parking Charges

7.12 The introduction of charges in any car park can be viewed from several different viewpoints. There is the general principle of whether or not it is reasonable that 'others' should provide the funding (maintenance and enforcement) for the use of a facility used by others. The general view of most people is that the fairest way to cover the costs associated with any car park is that it should be the burden of those that actually use the car park.

7.13 From a financial perspective, South Somerset's car parks are one of its most valuable assets. To not fully utilise the potential financial gains accrued by applying charges in off-street parking areas is unlikely to be sustainable in the future. The inconsistency across the whole administrative area of having parking charges only in some areas leads to potential enforcement issues and the car parks use being driven by the users, not by the Council, in policy and financial terms. South Somerset at some stage will need to make key decisions as to whether there is to be a concerted effort to restrain the use of the car or let car usage grow unchecked. It is understood and accepted that, for the most part, car usage in rural areas will always be higher due to lack of alternative transport options and has been highlighted in the Phase 2 report of this commission.

7.14 The introduction of charges would have an effect on the use of the car parks but this is generally seen as a temporary reaction. Generally, there is an initial reduction in the car parks use of approximately 20% but most users will revert to the car parks within 6 months. Where there are no current on street charges and minimal enforcement, it is likely the on-street provision would become saturated due to off-street patrons seeking to find free alternative parking options. Therefore it is generally recommended that a new charging regime is introduced concurrently with DPE.

Wincanton & Castle Cary

7.15 This would be true in both Castle Cary and Wincanton (it is likely it will be less than 20% and not as long as 6 months) as there are limited travel options. Having said this, the Council must be mindful not to compromise the attractiveness, vitality and commercial viability of relatively small towns by charging. This said it is not usually the charges per se which threaten the towns, it is the perception that the cost they are asked to pay is high. If there are no charges at all then generally most people will see any increase as high so it is important to view the first introduction of charges, if South Somerset decides to, not as a cost recovery exercise but as a positive action to manage the car park effectively and actively enforce trip restraint policies.

7.16 If charges are introduced they will need to be applied with a level of consistency across the whole town although it may be possible to apply different tariffs for the two towns. The towns are relatively small and there is a

real possibility that parking will be drained from the higher cost car park. There also needs to be consistency across the whole district. Not necessarily from the point of view of intermigration between the towns, but more for district wide tariffs control.

7.17 Both these towns would see various effects from the introduction of charges. The introduction of charges needs to be tempered against the potential detrimental effects of charging in the existing car parks. There is the possibility that many of those who currently park in the car parks will attempt to park on street. There are currently no charges for the on-street provision and as a long term strategy the Council will need to ensure that the introduction of charges does not have the effect of bleeding the car park. The easiest way to mitigate this is to have either restriction on street, which will in effect force patrons to use the car parks. Whilst this will be effective it is ultimately a rather draconian way of approaching this issue and would be viewed as an unreasonably harsh denial of unobjectionable parking space. The Council could introduce parking charges on street. This is considered a longer term district wide objective but should not be ruled out.

7.18 The argument that the introduction of charging will be detrimental to local business is often mentioned and cited as a key reason for not introducing parking charges. This argument is valid in certain circumstances but not all. For both Wincanton and Castle Cary it is considered that provisions can be made on street for the servicing of shops and other businesses. Should the basis of the argument be that shoppers will be discouraged from using the towns as charges have been introduced it should be remembered that there is a likelihood of increased turnover that will encourage more trade. A car park can be split into short and long stay to attempt to cater for most profiles wishing to use the car park but this would only work if charges were introduced otherwise it is virtually impossible to enforce.

7.19 Wincanton has 3 main car parks: Carrington Way, Churchfields and Memorial Hall. Carrington Way has a capacity of 100 spaces. As there is no charging there is no effective designation due to lack of enforcement capability (short, medium or long stay). The peak occupancy was 94%. As there is no fiscal constraint it is hardly surprising the occupancy is high. The concern with this car park, and all car parks that do not charge, is there is no managed turnover of spaces which effectively means that the car park can remain full for the whole day without drivers having to make a decision as to whether or not they need to be there as it cost nothing to do so. As would be expected, the occupancy levels are highest in the morning with 80 spaces taken between the period of 9.00am – 10.00am with an increase to 94 between the period of 11.00-12 noon. The occupancy drops to 64 in the afternoon is static throughout the afternoon. Castle Cary follows a similar pattern for its 2 main car parks with peak occupancy levels of 86% and 80% respectively (Millbrook Gardens and St. Catherine's Close).

7.20 There has often been put forward the argument that the introduction of charges will have an adverse effect on the local economy as people will seek alternative towns to visit and shop. Given the high occupancy and the possible

perception of a car park that is very full at times when most people would be inclined to shop and visit and the fact that there is little turnover in this period, it would not be unreasonable for South Somerset to consider that no charges are actually having a detrimental effect on the local economy as the town is considered an area where it is 'hard to park'. The introduction of charges may not change this (occupancy levels) and it may well be the case that the patrons of the car park are captive (i.e. more elastic to charges) although it would be prudent not to test this theory as this will give the perception of a revenue raising exercise rather than an attempt to manage the car park effectively.

7.21 All factors considered it is not unreasonable, in the first instance, to apply charges to the car parks in these towns and it is therefore recommended that a tariff of 30p per hour be imposed. The tariff structure should be similar to that currently employed in Ilminster (30p for 1 hour, 40p for 2 hours and £1.10 for all day).

7.22 The introduction of charges in both Castle Cary and Wincanton should **not** be implemented before DPE is introduced into the two towns.

7.23 **Bruton, Langport, Martock, Somerton & South Petherton –**

The situation in these smaller settlements is different again. The surplus/deficit figures in the forecast profiles are all small and therefore the priority to use charging to manage demand is low. It is recommended that these settlements are only brought under DPE as the last phase and this would be the appropriate time to consider introduction of charges at modest levels initially.

7.24 **Sunday charging**

Whilst there could be some concern that introduction of charges on Sundays could deter shoppers and visitors any such effect, if it occurred, would be confined to smaller towns where alternative, uncharged, parking opportunities exist. This would not be the case for the larger towns. Whatever individual's personal views on the matter, Sunday trading is now a permanent feature and there are moves to extend the hours. Therefore it is recommended that Sunday charges at a flat rate of 50p per visit be introduced in Yeovil initially and its effect monitored before extending this tariff elsewhere in the District.

7.25 **Blue Badge holders**

A number of authorities, including some of SSDC near neighbours, charge Blue Badge holders (BBH) the same tariff as other users. The argument here is that their needs have been addressed by sufficient, convenient, larger bays and there is no need for further concessions. This view is understood but there could still be hardship for individuals.

An alternative to full charging would be, when revisions are made to the administration of permits and season tickets, a permit is issued to BBH who are resident in the District that is valid in their local car park(s). SSDC may wish to consider this approach when deciding whether to charge BBH for parking.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 No detailed assessments of costs or revenue implications flowing from the study have been carried out yet. These will be assessed following consultation and the determination of the options and initiatives to be pursued. Current parking income makes an important contribution to the council's revenue budget. Any increased income from revision of tariff structures would offset increased expenditure and can be applied to other transport initiatives.

8.2 There would be three main strands to the assessment:

- The effect on income of any approved tariff changes and any new charges;
- A timeline profile of the effect on income and expenditure of development proposals, particularly the Yeovil UDF, but also specific proposals in other towns as these can impact permanently and during construction;
- A detailed financial profile for development, implementation and ongoing costs and income of a transfer to DPE, once the council have determined the timetable.

9. DPE Implementation Programme

9.1 The matrix below indicates an indicative timetable of DPE implementation throughout the South Somerset area. Given the different characteristics of the various towns in the area it is advised to adopt a phased implementation programme. The implementation of DPE in the various towns will have an effect on operations and financial viability and the programme has been devised in a manner to cater for possible adverse effects on both the financial viability and operational practicality. The phased implementation programme also allows South Somerset to gain some operational experience before rolling the programme out to other towns within the district.

9.2 The adverse effects on the financial viability has been catered for by delaying the implementation of those areas with questionable financial benefits beyond the first phase in an attempt to gain a surplus from those areas which are considered to be cost viable. The surplus can then be used to ensure that the whole account is financially viable despite the possibility of enforcement in certain towns running at a loss.

Town	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
Yeovil			
Chard			
Crewkerne			
Castle Cary			
Ilminster			
Wincanton			
Langport			
Martock			
S. Petherton			
Somerton			
Bruton			

9.3 Yeovil, Chard and Crewkerne should form phase I of the implementation programme. They offer, taking into account their size, amount of on-street parking restrictions and off street parking places, the best financial option for the initial phase. The issue of pressure on the on-street and off-street provision, and therefore the inherent need to actively manage and enforce the provision, has not been considered for the first phase as the priority is ensuring the financial viability although as stated in the demand/supply comparisons (as discussed in Chapter 5 of this report) both Yeovil and Crewkerne are seen as being towns where there will be a deficit in the parking stock.

9.4 Phase II should include Castle Cary, Ilminster and Wincanton. Both Castle Cary and Wincanton have either borderline or small deficits in parking stock. Ilminster is projected to have a large deficit in its parking stock. Active

enforcement of the parking stock will be crucial in this town, even to the extent that the Council may consider moving this town into the first phase.

9.5 Phase 3 includes the remaining towns within the South Somerset District Council administrative area. None of these towns have significant deficits anticipated. There are some towns which may not be cost viable given their size and restrictions to be enforced but as stated earlier a sufficient surplus should be realised to ensure the whole parking account does not run at a loss.

9.6 As mentioned in Appendix 4 it is not likely that South Somerset will be considering DPE for another year. Therefore the base year for phase I start (process, not go live date) is 2007. South Somerset will need to allow 18 months for the processing of DPE so the likely 'go live' date for phase 1 would be towards the end of 2008. It is not likely that South Somerset would be able to realise a surplus for 2/3 years but this should not affect the implementation of phase 2 as these towns are not seen as being financially dependent on the success of phase I. The suggested phased implementation, particularly phase II, is to ensure the size of the operation is manageable and offers the Council the opportunity to fine tune the operation before it is rolled out to the rest of the towns, so it is possible to implement phase II a relatively short period after Phase I.

10. Recommended Tariff changes

Yeovil – Short Stay

Raise tariff in Peter Street, South Street market, South Street, Newton Road & Park Street to £1.00. The 1 hour maximum stay should remain.

Medium Stay

Increase the long stay charge in Golden Stones to £2.00 and increase the short stay tariff to 50p for hour and £1.00 for 3 hours. As this car park has a peak occupancy level in excess of 85%, there is likely to be a degree of elasticity, which can be used to increase the tariff. It is not considered that such a rise would adversely affect the local economy.

Court Ash, Petters Way, Box factory, West Hendford and North Lane's 3 hour tariff should be raised to £1.50.

Medium/ Long Stay

Raise the tariff to £2.50 all day in Stars Lane West, Earle Street.

Long Stay

Raise the long stay tariff to £2.00 for Monday to Friday and £1.50 for Saturday.

Chard – Short Stay

Bath Street and Essex Close tariffs should be raised to 50p for 1 hour, 60p for 2 hours, 70p for three hours and £2.00 for 4 hours. The last tariff is reflective of the long stay provision within an officially designated short stay. The all day provision should be removed.

Medium Stay

Boden Street tariff should be raised to 50p for 1 hour, 60p for 2 hours and 70p for three hours. The all day provision should be removed. The season ticket price should be raised to £55 per 12 week period

Medium/Long Stay

The tariff should be increased to 50p for 2 hours. The long stay tariff should be increased to £1.50 (from £1.10) No

recommendations are made for the season ticket. These should remain at £30.00 for the 12 week period.

Long Stay

Crowshute tariff should be raised to £1.00 all day. The coach parking (all day) should be raised to £1.20 per day.

Crewkerne – Short Stay

It is recommended that South Street tariffs are amended as follows: 10p increase in the existing 1- 4 hours tariff bands. The ability to park all day should be removed or change the car park's designation. No changes are recommended for the season ticket price.

Medium/Long Stay

The tariffs in both Abbey Street and West Street should be increased to 40p for 1 hour and 50p for 2 hours. No changes should be made to the long stay tariff. No changes are recommended for the season ticket price.

Ilminster – Medium/Long Stay and Long stay

The changes recommended as similar to those for Crewkerne apart from West Street which should have the tariff increased from 70p to £1.00 (all day)

11. Summary of proposals

This section draws together the various recommended actions town by town, from throughout the study report.

District wide (Central or in all towns)

- Regular survey updates to monitor appropriateness of growth factors and demand profiles
- Review car park layouts to maximise capacity
- Keep car park designations under review and when appropriate, revise to deter all day parking
- Revise parking control methods to make them more user friendly and effective as need required and resources allow
- Consider the application of charges for Blue Badge holders and whether special concessions should be offered to residents in their locality
- Assess all opportunities for new or extended sites consistent with overall development policies
- Maintain initiatives with all stakeholders to promote and encourage provision and use of public transport, walking and cycling
- Close collaboration with developers, private car park operators, Town and Parish Councils but no further transfer of control

Bruton, Langport, Martock, Somerton & South Petherton

- Charging only to be introduced as demand pressures require and combined with DPE introduction
- To be part of the last phase of DPE implementation across the district

Castle Cary and Wincanton

- Introduce charges of 30p one hour, 40p two hours and £1.10 all day concurrently with DPE
- Include as part of phase 2 DPE implementation
- Develop decking proposals for Carrington Way as demand pressures require

Iminster

- Adopt as a priority the identifying of additional capacity
- Increase 1 hour to 40p and 2 hour to 50p, no other changes except all day in West Street increased to £1.00
- Include as part of Phase 2 of DPE implementation

Chard

- In Bath Street, Essex Close and Boden Street increase the tariff to 50p for 1 hour, 60p for 2 hours and 70p for three hours
- Increase 4 hour charge to £2.00 in short stay car parks to encourage transfer to long stay
- In Market Field, Combe Street and the Minnows increase the 2 hour tariff to 50p

- Remove all day designation at Bath Street, Boden Street and Essex Close
- Increase all day charge to £1.50 in long stay car parks
- Include in initial phase of DPE implementation
- Develop decking proposals for Crowshute as demand pressures require

Crewkerne

- Adopt as a priority the identifying of additional capacity
- Increase of 10p an hour in South Street car park for time bands up to and including 4 hours
- Remove all day designation at South Street
- Increase by 10p an hour for stays up to and including 2 hours with no change in long stay charges at Abbey and West Streets
- Include in initial phase of DPE implementation

Yeovil

- Raise the 1 hour tariff in Peter Street, South Street market, South Street, Newton Road & Park Street to £1.00. The 1 hour maximum stay should remain. (2 hours maximum in Newton Road)
- Increase the charges in Golden Stones to 50p for 1 hour and £1.00 for 3 hours. The long stay to increase to £2.00, which will bring this car park in line with other long stay tariffs.
- Court Ash, Petters Way, Box factory, West Hendford and North Lane's 3 hour tariff should be raised to £1.50
- Raise the all day tariff in Stars Lane West and Earle Street to £2.50
- Raise the all day tariff in long stay car parks to £2.00 Monday to Friday and £1.50 for Saturday.
- Introduce a flat visit charge of 50p on Sundays
- Include in initial phase of DPE implementation
- Develop decking proposals at Petters Way and Stars Lane West as part of comprehensive redevelopment plans to maintain appropriate capacity
- Re-consider introduction of Park and Ride facility (ies) so that it can assist modal shift and reduce demand

Tabulations of car parking survey results

A1.1 The on-street surveys collected the following information:

- I. **Total kerbside length (expressed in metres (M));**
- II. **Permissible length of kerbside parking;**
(Parallel and 90 degree parking which is also expressed as a percentage of the total kerbside length)
- III. **Total restriction length;**
(Expressed in M. This figure is also expressed as a percentage of the total kerbside length)
- IV. **Number of vehicles legally parked;**
(Counts separated for parallel and 90 degree parking)
- V. **Number of vehicles parking on highway restrictions;**
The counts have been split into the following vehicle categories:
 - Motorcycles
 - Cars, taxis and LGV's
 - MGV
 - HGV's
 - Coaches and buses

It should be noted that the figures in this category **do not** necessarily represent illegally parked vehicles. Vehicles may have been parked whilst loading or carrying out other legitimate business on the restrictions. A full compliance survey is considered beyond the scope of engagement.

- VI. **Total number of vehicles parked on highway restrictions;**

A1.2 The surveys were carried out, as agreed, on a rolling programme basis with each individual area being surveyed consecutively.

The on-street areas were surveyed on the following days and times:

Bruton	1 December 2005, 2.00pm
Castle Cary	30 November 2005, 2.00pm
Chard	30 November 2005, 10.00am
Crewkerne	30 November 2005, 9.00am
Illminster	30 November 2005, 11.30am
Langport	1 December 2005, 3.00pm
Martock	1 December 2005, 11.00am

Somerton	30 November 2005, 4.00pm
South Petherton	1 December 2005, 10.00am
Wincanton	30 November 2005, 3:00pm
Yeovil	29 November 2005, 2.00pm

For most of the areas 2 or 3 numerators were used. Yeovil, being significantly larger, required 6 numerators.

The individual survey data for on and off street can be found in related media to the right of the web page and is numbered as follows.

On Street parking surveys	42/a/1
Short/medium stay surveys	42/b/1 – 14
Long stay (Yeovil) surveys	42/c/1 – 5
Long stay (Excl. Yeovil) surveys	42/d/1 - 13

Derivation of demand profiles

A2.1 In order to simplify the preparation and assessment of the profiles, certain general assumptions have been made. These are applied to all profiling, unless otherwise indicated, and are:

- Base 1: Unrestrained growth of travel at 0.5% per year
- Base 2: As for Base 1 but at a rate of 1.0% per year
- Base 3: As for Base 1 but at a rate of 1.5% per year
- Housing: Assumes trajectory (4,715 more units from 2006 to 2010, '05 Base 68.951) achieved by 2011, then ½ year projection followed by 25% (236) of average rate thereafter. The differing planned units for each settlement are shown with the projection below;
- Congestion: No action results in driver choice to make less journeys to town, with 1% traffic growth ceasing from 2011
- Economy: Downturn in economy/oil price escalation results in 5% reduction, in 2008 say, with subsequent recovery resuming at 1% per year
- Modal shift: Assumes a shift of 5% or 10% achieved from 2011. Shift could be achieved voluntarily or via fiscal control. All based on a 1% growth rate that ceases from 2011. In previous drafts consideration was included for a modal shift of 15% but the Stakeholders Group considered this to be unachievable, therefore it is omitted from this report.

Housing growth tables

A2.2 These Tables set out the annual planned and anticipated increases in the number of housing units in the District as a whole and by settlement. The index is cumulative. Although there are differences in the percentage increase for each settlement, for the purposes of this study they are considered to be of minimal impact on the overall growth in parking demand.

Table A2.1: Housing growth across whole of SSDC

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
No of units	743	1093	992	974	913	502	266	266	266	266	266
Index value	101.1	102.7	104.1	105.5	106.8	107.6	108.0	108.3	108.7	109.1	109.5

A2.3 The figures for yearly growth in housing units are taken from the SSDC housing trajectory which is a formal council document produced from a combination of three sources: planning approvals, planning applications and discussions with county, government and the building industry. Since the housing growth factors were derived for this report, SSDC have updated their trajectory covering the period up to 2016. This indicates an increase in units of

8868 compared with 6547 used in the report. This would have the effect of changing the growth factor for 2016 to 1.131 compared with the figure of 1.095 used in the report. It is considered that this change of 3.5% would increase the overall demand profiles and therefore the pressure on supply in those towns where a deficit is profiled. It would not alter the general study findings or recommendations.

Table A2.2: Projected data trends for SSDC 2006-2016

Year	Base 1	Base 2	Base 3	Hsg	Congestion	Economy	Modal 1	Modal 2
2005	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2006	100.5	101.0	101.5	101.1	101.0	101.0	101.0	101.0
2007	101.0	102.0	103.0	102.7	102.0	102.0	102.0	102.0
2008	101.5	103.0	104.5	104.1	103.0	103.0	103.0	103.0
2009	102.0	104.0	106.0	105.5	104.0	98.0	104.0	104.0
2010	102.5	105.0	107.5	106.8	105.0	99.0	105.0	105.0
2011	103.0	106.0	109.0	107.6	106.0	100.0	106.0	106.0
2012	103.5	107.0	110.5	108.0	106.0	101.0	101.0	96.0
2013	104.0	108.0	112.0	108.3	106.0	102.0	102.0	96.9
2014	104.5	109.0	113.5	108.7	106.0	103.0	102.9	97.8
2015	105.0	110.0	115.0	109.1	106.0	104.0	103.9	98.7
2016	105.5	110.5	116.5	109.5	106.0	105.0	104.8	99.6

Assumptions:

- Shading indicates when step change occurs
- All indices (to one decimal place) relate to a base of 100 for 2005;
- Demographic mix does not change in new developments;
- The existing relationship between trip and parking demand patterns are unchanged by traffic growth or reduction;
- Attitudes and habits of the public do not change from existing.

Sample travel pattern changes

A2.4 The following section takes the projections and combines them into a range of changes to travel patterns and therefore parking demand and compares them with the existing situation. The range covers:

1. 2005 Base (existing)
2. Base + Housing planned development in SSDC
3. Base + Housing + national traffic growth at 1%
4. Base + Housing + national traffic growth at 1.5%
5. Base + Housing + national traffic growth 1%-modal shift of 5% in SSDC
6. Base + Housing + national traffic growth 1%-modal shift 10% in SSDC

For 6 the modal shift is achieved in 2011, 6A uses the same data but assume that a 5% modal shift is achieved in 2008 by voluntary initiatives with the full 10% being achieved in 2010.

A2.5 The reasons for the choice of these particular combinations are set out below. Congestion and economy have not been chosen because the former represents inaction by the Council and County, totally inconsistent with their declared policies and objectives.

1. 2005 Base: This demand is the existing situation derived from survey and provides the available surplus of capacity over demand
2. Base + housing projected to 2016 will effectively represent the projected base position
3. This change together with No.4 represent a reasonable assessment of possible growth locally; based on national figures. The inexorable rise in ownership and use of vehicles shows no sign of reaching a plateau, although inner urban areas show little if any growth overall. For rural A roads, Minor rural and minor urban roads the average % increase over the last five years has been 1.33 (Source DfT Transport Statistics). There is a higher rate of growth for light goods vehicles (small vans up to Transit size. Annual increases of 3-4% have been recorded. As these will form of the order of 5% of parked vehicles the higher choice of 1.5% annual growth should accommodate this aspect.
4. See 3 above
5. A modal shift of 5% achieved through voluntary initiatives and service improvements introduced by SSDC and SCC.
6. A modal shift of 10% is considered achievable by concerted action by the Council and County, public transport awareness and promotion, sustainable travel education and initiatives such as personalised travel plans could reach this level by voluntary means. DfT research has shown that in rural areas 2-6% reduction can be achieved by the last named. To achieve the full 10%, it is likely that the authorities would have to introduce controls as well as pursuing the voluntary changes outlined above. Such controls are likely to include disincentives such as differential tariffs and incentives such as attractive, competitively priced Park and Ride. Other than pilot projects it is unlikely that the more advanced aspects of road user pricing and congestion controls will be operational within the first 3-5 years of the period concerned and even then they would be in the most congested urban areas first.

Table A2.3: Combined travel pattern changes

Year	2	3	4	5	6	6A
2006	101.1	102.1	102.6	102.1	102.1	102.1
2007	102.7	104.8	105.8	104.8	104.8	104.8
2008	104.1	107.2	108.8	107.2	107.2	107.2
2009	105.5	109.7	111.8	109.7	109.7	101.8
2010	106.8	112.1	114.8	112.1	112.1	102.8
2011	107.6	114.1	117.3	114.1	114.1	97.7
2012	108.0	115.6	119.3	108.4	103.1	98.6
2013	108.3	117.0	121.3	109.4	104.5	99.4
2014	108.7	118.5	123.4	110.5	105.9	100.3
2015	109.1	120.0	125.5	111.5	107.4	101.2
2016	109.5	121.5	127.6	112.6	108.9	102.1

A2.6 As a comparator the Yeovil Transport Study Review modelled unrestrained increases over the 10 years 2002 to 2011 of 27.1% and 26.5% for the AM and PM peak hours respectively (*YTSR: Table 6.2, P120*). Although relating to a different, but overlapping, timescale and for 10 rather than 11 years the increase ranges are consistent with values above.

Comparison with TEMPRO database

A2.7 At the last steering group meeting SCC raised the use of TEMPRO data to input the demand profiling. It was agreed that Project Centre, SSDC and SCC officers would meet to discuss methodology relating to this and the use of the SATURN model for Yeovil. This meeting was held on 23 May.

A2.8 TEMPRO database of travel trip end factors is applied to national traffic forecasts to reflect regional variations. The database is derived from planning data covering, inter alia, population, income, households, and employment. It is produced by the Department of Transport (DfT) and regularly updated.

A2.9 It was not possible to use the current version because it has been withdrawn by the DfT because of a fundamental error. This issue will not be resolved before the end of June.

A2.10 The growth forecasts used in the study report were chosen to be simple, transparent and easily followed by those who are not transport professionals. TEMPRO is a nationally recognised methodology and outputs used in the study report should be compared with TEMPRO. With the unavailability of the current version the county supplied previous growth factors for the study period and these are used in the comparisons below.

A2.11 DfT traffic forecasts are based on a low, central and high range of growth factors. The study report used the specific housing trajectory forecasts for SSDC and two annual traffic growth factors of 1.0% and 1.5%. The outputs from these two approaches is summarised below.

A2.12 As the current TEMPRO database is not available at present no conclusions should be drawn at this stage from Table A2.4 below although:

- The local TEMPRO modifier for Yeovil marginally reduces the overall growth forecast whereas it is an increase for the rest of the District;
- Although derived by different methodologies from essentially the same sources the forecasts fall within similar ranges;
- Using the study 1.0% (para. 5.20) annual linear growth the 2011 forecasts are higher than the DfT High growth factor whilst by 2016 the study factor has dropped relatively to below the DfT Low band for most of the district and between the Central and high for Yeovil;
- Given that these factors are often being applied to small numbers of vehicles with other assumptions the differences are small for the smaller settlements
- **As an example only** of the widest variance, if the low DfT range was applied to Yeovil for 2016 the surplus/(deficit) figures would be:

option	3	4	5	6
DfT modified Low range	(128)	(224)	13	72
Study 1.0% Para. 5.26	(219)	(320)	(71)	(10)

Table A2.4 Comparison using TEMPRO

Forecast	2006	2011	2016
Base factors:			
DfT (car) Low	1.000	1.055	1.109
Central	1.000	1.076	1.153
High	1.000	1.087	1.183
TEMPRO SSDC Rural			
Yeovil	1.000	0.984	0.984
Adjusted factors:			
SSDC Rural Low	1.000	1.072	1.151
Central	1.000	1.093	1.197
High	1.000	1.104	1.228
Study factors (Table A2.3):			
Column 3 Lower 1.0%	1.000	1.118	1.143
Column 4 Higher 1.5%	1.000	1.190	1.244
Adjusted factors:			
Yeovil Low	1.000	1.038	1.091
Central	1.000	1.059	1.135
High	1.000	1.070	1.164
Study factors (Table A2.3):			
Column 3 Lower 1.0%	1.000	1.118	1.143
Column 4 Higher 1.5%	1.000	1.190	1.244

Results of tariff modelling

Introduction

Project Centre, as part of this commission, has modelled the car parks within South Somerset District Council's administrative area. The purpose of the modelling is to provide South Somerset with a health check for their car parks, in terms of correct designation/management. As part of the modelling, an analysis of the ticket machine audit data has also been carried out, not only to inform the decision making process but also to provide South Somerset with information relating to how many and how long patrons are parking for.

The modelling ultimately provides what it considers to be the 'best' tariff for the car parks. Two of the input fields within the model tie the tariffs recommended to certain local constraints such as median house prices (house pricing index) and GVA (gross value added). Both of these ensure the tariffs recommended are localised and are based on the local economy.

The recommendation for introducing, or not as the case may be, charges in towns that at present do not charge has not been modelled. The limitation of any type of tariff modelling is the need to be able to gather historical financial data in order to predict a suggested scenario.

Certain key factors have been highlighted below in order to provide a further understanding of certain aspects of this part of the commission.

Methodology

A3.1 Understanding the portfolio

- Understanding customer segments for each site (duration of stay). This data source has been extracted from the ticket audits, which were provided to Project Centre earlier in the year.
- Identify 'fair' market price by customer segment/parking occasion for each site.
- Measure/predict capacity constraints for each site
- Identify strategic and competitive constraints on future pricing actions/policies. *See constraints below*

A3.2 Cannibalisation between tariffs (one tariff band absorbed into another)

- Cannibalisation between tariffs is not recommended for South Somerset but in some situations can and has been used. This is effectively when a particular tariff band is removed and rolled into the next upper tariff band. This is not appropriate for South Somerset, apart from where it has been specifically applied in certain car parks, due to the low hourly tariffs and non linear relationship between the

shorter tariffs. As an example should a 2 hours stay period be required and it was cannibalised, should someone require to park for just over an hour, as there is no band set up for a 2 hour period they would effectively have to pay for 3 hours.

Key Factors

A3.3 Economics

- Local market share (bleeding on site for/to another, consistency of tariff)
 - Local Market share is a driver for the general recommendations as the percentage of market share is obviously a contributor to performance of the portfolio as a whole. In general terms the higher the percentage of the parking places in the area you own the more elastic you can be as there is a minimal likelihood of patrons seeking (and finding) parking places outside of the portfolio. Whilst, in isolation, this aspect of the exercise can be viewed with a degree of flexibility if South Somerset owns/operates the majority of the car parks in the towns, the relationship of tariffs across the car parks within the town must be considered as an integral part of the decision making process.

A3.4 Elasticities

Elasticity by site

- Local untapped demand
 - As the title suggests the local untapped demand will be those that do not use the car parks. Given the high trips for most rural areas it is not thought that this would be a factor which will figure significantly as those not using the car park will, in all likelihood, have made alternative parking arrangements.
- Competitive intensity (see A3.5 below)

A3.5 Elasticity by tariff

- Elasticities by customer segments/parking occasion
 - Patrons of the car parks, dependant on which category they are in (commuter, shopper & visitor), will have differing views relating to what they are prepared to pay. This is largely dependant on how often they use the car park, for how long and why. Long term frequent users tend to be very price sensitive (inelastic) and will seek an alternative car parks as the accumulative tariff increase effect is very pronounced. Occasional users will not be so price sensitive but will be affected by issues such as proximity, perception of safety. The

recommendations have taken into account the tariff bands usage from which we are able to build the profile. From this data we can apply constraints such as high or low percentage increases dependant on the elasticity of the user profile.

A3.5 Constraints

- Fair market price
 - Fair market price is derived from the perception of what patrons believe is a reasonable price to pay for parking all contributory factors considered. This will include aspects such as competition intensity (opportunity to park elsewhere) and price comparison. Through the data submitted by South Somerset combined with the surveys that Project Centre carried out it is possible to produce a profile of parking intensity and therefore the perceived value of parking costs.

For the purpose of this commission, the recommended outputs are tied to strategic, operational and competitive constraints for each site to reduce the risk of/to revenue evaporation, settlements economics, viability and attractiveness.

A3.5.1 Strategic Constraints

- Price ceilings and floors for each car park based on local indicators
- Maximum price increases to remove the risk of non-competitive pricing (too high). Price rises, if appropriate, 'hidden' in tariff structure. Also possible to raise tariffs to more convenient coin denomination.
- Price decreases restricted due to limited potential benefit (especially in high occupancy car parks) Vs risk (operational costs not covered).

A3.5.2 Operational Constraints

- Push prices 'harder' in capacity constrained sites (high occupancy)
 - The higher occupancy car parks have a proven track record of 'good performance'. Therefore it is possible to increase the hourly tariff by a higher percentage. This can be done in an attempt to reduce the maximum occupancy or increase the revenue stream for the Council. However, this needs to be carefully applied (if at all) to ensure that it does not compromise the 'fair price'.
- Choose optimal tariff structure for existing stay length profile/occasional mix.
 - The choice of optimum tariff is largely dependent on the existing profile of users. This is used to provide an 'ideal' cost based on the elasticities of each user profile. It is essentially a compromise between the maximum revenue possible and all other restraining factors (competition, fair pricing, price alignment etc.)

- Price alignment with nearby sites to prevent 'bleeding'.
 - Price alignment has been applied to ensure there is a measure of consistency across the portfolio to prevent one particular car park being more attractive than another.

A3.5.3 Competitive Constraints

- Maximum price position Vs. competing sites where competition pool is large. There is a point at which the pricing position (tariff) South Somerset adopt should be reflective of the competition pool, which potential customers can choose from. This not only applies to competitive car parks not owned/managed by South Somerset but also those within the portfolio
- Maximum price for 15/30 minute pricing driven by local on-street competition. Not applicable at present but could become a factor within the life cycle of the strategy if DPE/on street charging implemented.

A3.6 Data Analysis

Yeovil – Short Stay

Peter Street – Peter Street has a capacity of 23 spaces. The data provided indicates there is only one ticket machine for this car park. This car park is categorised as short stay with a tariff of 80p per hour and a maximum permitted parking period of 1 hour. The ticket audit readout indicates that there was an average of 264 transactions on the 11, 13 & 15 Oct 2005 in the category of 80p-£1.00. However, the last audited emptying of the machine was recorded as the 8, 11 & 13th Oct 05 respectively so it is necessary to extrapolate the information for daily transaction figures by dividing by a factor of 3. This actual daily average transaction figures are 88. The data provided also indicates that there were average transaction figures of 30 in the £1.00-£10.00 transaction band.

The above figures indicate scope to amend this car park in two principle ways. There is the possibility to raise the hourly tariff to £1.00 per hour. This appears to be already happening and is likely to be occurring due to coin denomination convenience. There is also scope to re-designate this car park as a short/medium stay car park. As there are no enforcement figures available, it is not possible to ascertain exactly what the compliance level is but in terms of South Somerset future aspirations (DPE in particular) there will a point where those paying more than 80p for additional hours may be subject to enforcement action due to the current maximum permitted period.

From phase one of the parking strategy exercise it is seen that there is generally good occupancy in this car park. There are occupancy figure in excess of 20 for the whole morning (apart from the 10am-11am period which is 19) with a natural 'tail off' for the rest of the day as

demand decreases. The restrictions around this car park do not allow for on-street parking and there is no season ticket availability.

South Street – South Street has a capacity of 29 spaces. The data provided indicates there is only one ticket machine for this car park. This car park is also categorised as short stay with a tariff of 80p per hour and a maximum permitted parking period of 1 hour. The ticket audit readout indicates that there was an average of 253 transactions on the 11, 13 & 15 Oct 2005 in the category of 80p-£1.00. However, the last audited emptying of the machine was recorded as the 8, 11 & 13th Oct 05 respectively so it is necessary to extrapolate the information for daily transaction figures by dividing by a factor of 3. This actual daily average transaction figures are 84. The data provided also indicates that there were average transaction figures of 21 in the £1.00-£10.00 transaction band.

The above figures indicate scope to amend this car park by providing a longer permitted period. The relatively low utilisation (37% max) may be representative of the car park not actually providing what those visiting actually require in terms of permitted parking time. The occupancy figures also indicate that this car park will be price sensitive and any move to increase tariffs at this site will need to be carefully thought through. There is no season ticket availability at this site.

South Street Market – South Street market has a capacity of 45 spaces and a peak occupancy of 115%. The 115% peak occupancy is representative of patrons circulating or waiting for parking spaces to become available. The data provided indicates there is only 1 ticket machine. This car park is designated as a short stay car park with a current tariff of 80 per hour with 1 hour maximum stay. The ticket audit readout indicates there was an average of 204 transactions per day. 164 (80%) are in the 80p-£1.00 transaction band and 40 (20%) in the £1.00-£10.00 transaction band. Whilst 20% of the patrons are paying for time beyond the 1 hour limit, it does not justify making changes to this car park. The only recommended change for this car park is to increase the hourly tariff as indicated in chapter 10.

Park Street – Park Street has a capacity of 15 spaces. The data provided indicates there is only one ticket machine for this car park. This car park is also categorised as short stay with a tariff of 80p per hour and a maximum permitted parking period of 1 hour. The ticket audit readout indicates that there was an average of 173 transactions on the 12 & 15 Oct 2005 in the category of 80p-£1.00. However, the last audited emptying of the machine was recorded as the 8 & 12th Oct 05 respectively so it is necessary to extrapolate the information for daily transaction figures by dividing by a factor of 4. This actual daily average transaction figures are 43. The data provided also indicates that there were average transaction figures of 16 in the £1.00-£10.00 transaction band.

The survey figures from this car park indicate that it may be used as an overspill car park. The occupancy is erratic throughout the day and does not have the measure of consistency which others car parks in Yeovil have. This may be due to the fact that there is not an established parking generator close by.

The general pattern of usage indicates this car park is very price sensitive as it could be termed a second car park and its charging profile those car parks which bleed into Park Street. It is important that this car park's tariffs do not exceed the feeder car parks as these other car parks appear to provide the profile for the users. Another possibility for this car park is to change its designation, which may attract untapped local or inter regional demand.

It is not likely that there is 'competition' between the on-street parking provision and Park Street car park but given its occupancy sensitivity a careful judgement needs to be made if any additional on – street spaces are created in close vicinity to either the car park itself or its feeder car parks.

Newton Road – Newton Road has a capacity of 16 spaces. The data provided indicates there is only one ticket machine for this car park. This car park is also categorised as short stay with a tariff of 80p per hour and a maximum permitted parking period of 2 hours. The ticket audit readout indicates that there was an average of 92 transactions on the 12 & 15 Oct 2005 in the category of 80p-£1.00. However, the last audited emptying of the machine was recorded on the 8 & 12th Oct 05 respectively so it is necessary to extrapolate the information for daily transaction figures by dividing by a factor of 4. The actual daily average transaction figures are 60. The data provided also indicates that there were average transaction figures of 33 in the £1.00-£10.00 transaction band.

The occupancy level reached a peak of 81%, which was achieved at 10am- 11am. The price sensitivity in terms of occupancy is such that an increase in the hourly tariff would not be detrimental to the current occupancy levels, therefore the recommendation, in Chapter 10, is to recommend a change in the hourly tariff from (80p to £1.00). The 0-1 hour period still makes a significant portion of those using this car park and as such tariff cannibalisation should be avoided.

Yeovil - Medium Stay

Court Ash – Court Ash has a capacity of 106. The data provided indicates that there is only one ticket machine for this car park. This car park has 3 tariff bands (although the ticket machine audit indicates 8 transaction categories which is reflective of those who have used the £1.00 for each subsequent hour category band) of £1.00 for two hours, £1.20 for three hours and £1.00 for each subsequent hour. The audit readout indicates that there is a daily average transaction figure of 360.

Of these 306 are in the £1.00 to £1.40 transaction band (85%) although it is to be noted that 26 transactions are in the £2.00-£2.60 transaction band (i.e. full 3 hour period). This car park has no season ticket provision

The car park is generally used as per the designation and there is no need to change the designation at this moment in time. The tariff bands have been cannibalised not to allow a tariff for 1 hour, which is reflective of its designation. Allowing a 1 hour tariff is not recommended as patrons appear to be willing to pay the minimum band of 2 hours even if they only wish to park for 1 hour. This in part may be due to the convenience of using a single coin for the minimum period.

Petters Way – Petters Way has a capacity of 213. The data provided indicates that there are three ticket machines for this car park. This car park has 3 tariff bands (although the ticket machine audit indicates 7 transaction categories for 2 machines (Nos. 2 and 3) and 8 for ticket machine 1, which is reflective of those who have used the £1.00 for each subsequent hour category band) of £1.00 for two hours, £1.20 for three hours and £1.00 for each subsequent hour. The audit readout indicates that there is a daily average transaction figure of 424. Of these 356 are in the £1.00 to £1.40 transaction band (84%) although it is to be noted that 39 transactions are in the £2.00-£2.60 transaction band (i.e. full 3 hour period). This car park has a season ticket provision, which costs £300 per 12 week period.

As with Court Ash, the car park is generally used as per the designation and there is no need to change the designation at this moment in time. The tariff bands have again been cannibalised not to allow a tariff for 1 hour, which is reflective of its designation. Allowing a 1 hour tariff is not recommended as patrons appear to be willing to pay the minimum band of 2 hours even if they only wish to park for 1 hour. This in part may be due to the convenience of using a single coin for the minimum period.

Box Factory – Box Factory has a similar profile, in terms of tariff structure and cost, maximum permitted period and season ticket provision as Petters Way. Box factory has a capacity of 128. Box factory has a peak occupancy level of 55 vehicles (10am-11am) with a steady decrease in occupancy throughout the day from 1pm. The morning occupancy is stabilised at a high occupancy level (53-55 vehicles). There are no recommended changes for this car park apart from the raising of the 3 hour tariff (see Chapter 10) which are based on consistency with the portfolio rather than incorrect tariffs being used in the car park.

West Hendford – West Hendford has a capacity of 169 and peak occupancy of 86% (10am-11am) with a steady decline throughout the

day. This car park has only 2 tariff bands which is representative of the 1 hour tariff band having been cannibalised although the ticket machine audit data shows 3 transaction categories (£1.00-£1.40, £1.40-£1.60 and £2.00-£2.60). The data provided indicates this car park has 2 ticket machines with average daily transaction figures of 436. The vast majority of these (98%) transactions occur in the £1.00-£1.40 transaction band indicating that the car park offers the length of stay that most patrons require. Although the numbers are very low in terms of transactions, some patrons are attempting to purchase more time than the maximum permitted parking period. No changes are suggested for this car park apart from the three hour tariff being raised to £1.50.

North Lane – North Lane is very similar in parking pattern and tariff banding to West Hendford. It has a capacity of 52 and a peak occupancy of 148% (10am-11am) with a steady, but declining, occupancy levels until 4pm-5pm. This car park has only 2 tariff bands which is representative of the 1 hour tariff band having been cannibalised although the ticket machine audit data shows 3 transaction categories (£1.00-£1.40, £1.40-£1.60 and £2.00-£2.60). The data provided indicates this car park has 1 ticket machine with average daily transaction figures of 202. The vast majority of these (99%) transactions occur in the £1.00-£1.40 transaction band indicating that the car park offers the length of stay that most patrons require. As with West Hendford, the numbers are very low in terms of transactions, but some patrons are attempting to purchase more time than the maximum permitted parking period. The amount of patrons attempting to do this does not justify a change in the car parks designation.

Goldenstones – Goldenstones has a capacity of 144. There is a separate short stay and long stay area. 71 bays are in the short stay area, 64 bays are in the long stay area and 9 disabled bays. The data provided indicates there are 2 ticket machines, one machine in each area. The surveys indicate the entire car park was at its maximum occupancy between 12:00pm-1:00pm (86%). The car park does not offer a season ticket provision.

Short stay area: The short stay area has 2 tariff bands and a maximum stay of 3 hours. The data provided indicates there is a daily transaction figure of 204. Of these 102 (50%) have paid to stay 3 hour and the remaining 102 (50%) have paid for 1 hour. The ticket sales were spread evenly over the operating hours (9am to 6pm).

Long stay area: From the information provided the long stay area has 3 tariff bands. The data indicates there is a daily transaction figure of 43. Of these 16 (37.2%) have paid to stay all day, 13 (30.2%) have paid to stay 3 hours and the remaining 13 (30.2%) paid to stay 1 hour. 23 tickets (53.5%) were sold before midday, 12 (27.9%) were sold between 12pm - 3pm and the remaining 8 (18.6%) were sold after 3pm.

The 40p for one hour tariff is significantly lower price than all the other car parks that were analysed in the area. In both the short stay and the long stay area, half of the patrons stayed for 1 hour or less increasing the elasticity (not sensitive to price changes) of the lowest price tariff. It is noted of the 102 patrons that stayed for one hour 17 (16.8%) patrons paid 50p instead of 40p.

The information indicates the car park had a maximum occupancy of 86% during the day. It is recommended (see Chapter 7, section 10) that the one hour tariff should be increased from 40p to 50p, the 3 hour tariff be increased from 80p to £1.00 and the all day tariff increasing from £1.60 to £2.00. It should be noted that a new 40p for 1 hour tariff has been introduced for visitors using the Swimming Pool.

Star Lane West – Star Lane West has a capacity of 202. The data provided indicates that there are two ticket machines and 4 tariff bands (although the ticket machine audit indicates 5 transaction categories on one machine and 6 transaction categories on the other). The audit readout indicated that there is a daily average transaction figure of 434. Of these 320 are in the lower transaction bands (73.7%), of £1.00 for two hours and £1.20 for three hours. The majority of the remaining transactions were in the £2.40 all day tariff band (17.8%). The car park was at its maximum occupancy between 12:00pm-1:00pm (92%). The car park offers a season ticket provision at a cost of £150.00 per quarter.

Although the car park has been designated as a Medium/Long stay, the analysis of the transactions indicates almost 75% of patrons use the car park for less than 3 hours. For the shorter stay tariff (less than 3 hours) an increase in the tariff would not be considered to be particularly detrimental due to the high number of patrons parking for this period.

Earle Street – Earle Street has a capacity of 67. The data provided indicated that there is only one 1 ticket machine for this car park. This car park has 4 tariff bands (although the ticket machine audit indicates 5 transaction categories). The audit readout indicated that there is a daily average transaction figure of 82. Of these 38 are in the lowest transaction bands (46.9%) of £1.00 for 2 hours and £1.20 for 3 hours. 36 transactions are in the higher band (43.1%) £2.40 enabling them to stay all day. The car park was at its maximum occupancy between 12:00pm-1:00pm (94%). The car park offers a season ticket provision at a cost of £150.00 per quarter.

Although the car park has been designated as a Medium/ Long Stay, the analysis of transactions indicates the car park is equally used by

patrons parking for less than 3 hours as those who park all day. The maximum occupancy of 94% indicates that the car park is often near capacity and could sustain a small price rise without significant adverse affect on its usage. Due to its proximity to the Bus Station, it is likely that this car park also acts as an interchange. This car park, apart from the tariffs, should not be altered as the car park offers patrons the ability to change to a more sustainable mode of transport.

Yeovil – Long Stay

Car Park	Tariff (Mon-Fri)	Tariff (Sat)	Capacity	Max Occupancy (%)	Permit Y/N	Permit cost
Brunswick Street	£1.60 (all day)	£1.30 (all day)	60	93	Yes	£80.00
Fairfield	£1.60 (all day)	£1.30 (all day)	91	100	Yes	£80.00
Market Street	£1.60 (all day)	£1.30 (all day)	29	100	Yes	£80.00
Huish	£1.60 (all day)	£1.30 (all day)	223	100	Yes	£80.00
Goldcroft	£1.60 (all day)	£1.30 (all day)	109	97	Yes	£80.00
Mill Lane	£1.60 (all day)	£1.30 (all day)	88	92	NO	N/A

The table above shows the main operational information for the long stay car parks in Yeovil. There is one transaction category (£1.00-£10.00), which is reflective of the car parks designation with the daily transaction figures being considerably lower than the short and medium stay car parks. This is to be expected as there is less turnover of the parking spaces throughout the day.

The price of the season ticket varies according to the designation of the car park (medium stay £300, medium/long stay £150 and long stay £80. It is recommended that the current prices be changed but it would be prudent to ensure that the prices of the season tickets are reviewed on a yearly basis.

Chard – Short Stay

Bath Street – Bath Street has capacity of 126 with a peak occupancy of 62, occurring between 11am – 12 noon. This car park is categorised as a short stay car park although there is a tariff available to park all day (currently £2.00). Bath Street car park has 4 tariff bands, which is reflective by the transaction categories in the ticket audit.

Essex Close - Essex Close has capacity of 102 with peak occupancy of 64, occurring between 11am – 12 noon. This car park is categorised as a short stay car park but unlike Bath Street, Essex Close transactions are grouped into one transaction category. The data provided indicates an average daily transaction figure of 292.

Both short stay car parks in Chard have similar characteristics in terms of usage, transaction profile and tariff bandings. Both operate reasonably efficiently and provide the length of stay that is reflective of local parking needs. The all day provision in both car parks should be removed and tariffs increased as indicated in Chapter 10. As mentioned previously in the report, South Somerset needs to be mindful of those who will/may fall foul of the maximum permitted parking period, especially once enforcement takes place on a regular basis.

Chard – Medium/Long Stay

Boden Street – Boden Street (medium stay) has a capacity of 66. The data provided indicates that there is 1 ticket machine for this car park. This car park has 4 tariff bands (although the ticket machine audit indicates 3 transaction categories) of 30p for 1 hour, 40p for two hours, 60p for three hours, £1.40 for 4 hours and £2.00 all day. The audit readout indicates that there is a daily average transaction figure of 99 across all transaction categories. Of these the vast majority are split between the 20p - 40p (30) and 40p - £1.00 (42) transaction band. This car park has a season ticket provision, which costs £50.00 per 12 week period.

The car park is generally used as per the designation bias is towards the shorter and the all day provision should be removed. The tariff bands have not been cannibalised, like the medium stay in Yeovil, and allows a tariff for 1 hour which is reflective of its designation. The operation of the car park is good with consistent occupancy levels throughout the day.

Car Park	Tariff	Capacity	Max % Occupancy	Permit Y/N	Permit cost	Average transactions per day
Market Field	40p for 2 hours, £1.10 all day	77	62.5	Y	£30.00	83
Combe Street	As above	29	86	Y	£30.00	18 *
The Minnows	As above	40	60	Y	£30.00	59 *

* Likely there is incomplete data for these car parks

The table above shows the main operational information for the Medium/long stay car parks in Chard. There are 2 transaction categories (20p – 50p & 50p-£9.99) which are reflective of the car

parks designation with the daily transaction figures being slightly lower than the short and medium stay car parks. This is to be expected as the turnover of the parking spaces throughout the day is less. There are no recommendations to change any of the operational aspects of the medium/long stay car parks in Chard. The occupancy levels for both Marketfield and The Minnows are relatively low which indicates price sensitive patrons.

Chard – Long Stay

Crowchute – Crowchute is the only official dedicated long stay car park in Chard. It has a capacity of 72, peak occupancy of 44% and a season ticket provision, which currently costs £25 per 12 week period. Suggested tariff changes are proposed in Chapter 10 due to the relatively low occupancy. The low occupancy is due to low demand rather than the perception of the cost being high.

Crewkerne – Short Stay

South Street – South Street has a capacity of 271. The data provided indicates that there are three ticket machines for this car park. This car park has 6 tariff bands (although the ticket machine audit indicates 4 transaction categories). The audit readout indicates that there is a daily average transaction figure of 801. Of these 467 are in the 20p to 40p transaction band (58%) although it is noted that 211 transactions are in the 40p to £1.00 transaction band. This car park offers a season ticket provision at a cost of £35.00 per quarter.

The car park is generally used as per the designation and there is no need to change the designation at this moment in time although as with other car parks there is inconsistency between the official designation and what it actually offers. This causes no operational difficulties but there needs to be more robust management to ensure that the car park has a short stay bias.

The tariff bands have not been cannibalised and allow a tariff for 1 hour, which is reflective of its designation and is the correct manner in which to manage the tariff structure for this car park. Allowing a 1 hour tariff appears to work well and offers patrons the hours they wish to park for which can be seen in the transaction figures above although the Council should give consideration to removing the all day parking provision. The Council should also attempt to ensure that the most popular tariff banding can be paid for by a single coin, which in this case, is up to 2 hours (currently 40p) to 50p, see section 10. The development issues that affect this particular site are discussed in more detail in 5.2 above.

Crewkerne – Medium/Long Stay

Abbey Street – Abbey Street has a capacity of 55 and a peak occupancy of 95% (12 noon to 1.00pm). The data provided indicates that there is only 1 ticket machine for this car park. This car park has 3 tariff bands (although the ticket machine audit indicates 2 transaction categories). The audit readout indicates that there is a daily average transaction figure of 49. Of these 37 are in the higher 50p to 999.99 transaction band (75.5%) which is reflective of the designation. This is an indication that the car park is used by most of the patrons in accordance with its designation and provides the length of stay most users want. This car park offers a season ticket provision at a cost of £35.00 per quarter.

Whilst as a general principle cannibalisation of tariffs is not recommended, the principal of removing the 1 hour stay band has been set in other medium/long stay car parks in South Somerset (Chard). In terms of consistency with the car parks designation and better management of the car park, South Somerset should give further consideration to removing the 1 hour tariff band. This could allow the 2 hour band to be raised to 50p (see Chapter 10), which is a far more convenient coin denomination.

West Street - West Street has a capacity of 67 and peak occupancy of 78%. The data indicates there is only 1 ticket machine for this car park. This car park has 3 transaction categories (although the ticket machine audit indicates only 1 transaction category). There is a daily transaction figure of 49, which is reflective of its use and occupancy levels. No recommendations for changes are suggested for this car park. South Somerset should allow the 2 hour band to be raised to 50p.

Ilminster – Medium/Long Stay

Shudrick Lane – Shudrick Lane has a capacity of 150 and peak occupancy of 86% (12 noon to 1.00pm). The data provided indicates that there is only 1 ticket machine for this car park. This car park has 3 tariff bands (although the ticket machine audit indicates 4 transaction categories). This is representative of the car parks' designation contradicting what the patrons of the car park actually require in terms of parking period.

The audit readout indicates that there is a daily average transaction figure of 191. Of these 84 are in the 30p to 40p transaction band which is 44% of the total average daily transactions. This is an indication that the car park has significant use by those wishing to park for 1 or 2 hours despite its designation and should the development of Tesco remove parking spaces there will be a need ensure a significant portion of the car park is given over to short stay users. There is a need to change the designation of this car park. The medium/long stay designation is misleading to the public and may also lead to the Council managing the car park as long stay when in reality a shorter

stay appears to be what the patrons actually require. Further comment is made about the Tesco development in paragraph 5.14.

Orchard Vale – Orchard Vale has a capacity of 58 and peak occupancy of 88%. The data indicates there is only 1 ticket machine for this car park. This car park has 3 transaction categories (although the ticket machine audit indicates only 1 transaction category). There is a daily average transaction figure of 48, which is reflective of its use and occupancy levels. As all the transactions are in one tariff band no further analysis can be carried out. Apart from the tariff increase (see Chapter 10) no recommendations for changes are suggested for this car park.

Ilminster – Long Stay

West Street – West Street has a capacity of 41 and peak occupancy of 90%. The data indicates there is 1 ticket machine for this car park. This car park has 3 transaction categories (although the audit indicates 2 transaction categories, 20p - 50p and 50p - 999.99). There is a daily transaction figure of 38 in the 20p – 50p transaction band and 32 in the 50p - 999.99 transaction bands. Given its designation as a long stay car park there is an unusually high percentage of transaction in the 20p – 50p band and like Shudrick Lane, there may be a need to redesignate this car park. South Somerset should raise the all day tariff from 70p to £1.00 (Chapter 10).

De-criminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE)

A4.1 South Somerset District Council over the next 2-3 years will need to decide whether DPE is an avenue they wish to pursue. There are many operational and financial aspects, which have to be considered before the decision to take up the powers in the Road Traffic Act 1991 are used.

A4.2 Within a Special Parking Area (SPA) the responsibility for the enforcement of virtually all parking places passes from the police (via traffic wardens) to the highway/traffic authority. The income from the parking tickets issued is retained by the authority to fund the operational costs. Any surpluses that are gained from the operation are currently ring fenced under section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act and can only be used for transport related schemes. The Traffic Management Bill allows, in certain circumstances (i.e. proven traffic record of astute financial management of the parking account), the ring fence to be widened to encompass other schemes such as regeneration initiatives.

A4.3 The generally accepted time scale to implement DPE is 2 years from start to completion. There are many tasks, which need to be completed in this time. The key tasks are listed below:-

Waiting and loading review – The DfT, who ultimately sign the designation order, expect a full and comprehensive review of the existing waiting and loading restrictions. This review has two aims: (a) to ensure that the restrictions are an accurate reflection of the existing traffic orders and that the appropriate signs and lines are in enforceable condition; and (b) to ensure that the restrictions applied to a certain length of road are appropriate for the prevailing conditions. This can mean that in a review of the restrictions, restrictions can be reduced as well as increased if necessary.

Financial Assessment – The financial assessment is key to the viability of the operation. The DfT have an expectation that all the operation costs and initial capital costs will be balanced against the income that is derived from the operation. The regulations governing a successful application to the DfT are clear in their statement that the DPE operation must be self financing and must not be a burden on the overall finances of the Council. The financial appraisal however will take into account schemes that will boost the income from the operation such as proposals for controlled parking zones which can have a dramatic effect on the revenue streams in terms of Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's), parking permits charges and pay and display revenue. Should a financial appraisal include the funds from any such proposal, this is in effect an undertaking by the submitting authority to actually implement the scheme in the timescale indicated in the submitted application.

Enforcement - The Council will need to enforce both existing and future restrictions. The council will need to make a decision as to whether it has an in-house operation or contracts out the enforcement. This is a decision which is based principally on the ability to actually manage the operation and the political inclinations at the time the decision is made. Many authorities chose to out source the enforcement of their restrictions as there is very often great difficulty in recruiting the appropriate skills and experience which are needed to run such a large operation. The contracting out of enforcement could include, if South Somerset wanted to have an all encompassing contract, cash collection, tow-away facilities (for which a secure pound is necessary) and PCN processing. The contractor will provide what they believe to be the appropriate level of parking attendants (PA) dependant on the Service Level Agreement (SLA) written in the contract documentation (which is usually expressed as the amount of 'passes' a PA will make over in a certain area/road over a given period (usually the shift period).

Processes

A4.4 There are several key advantages to acquiring the DPE powers which for South Somerset District would be:-

- A coordinated parking enforcement service could be established, covering both on and off-street parking
- The service will be self financing, and should recover the initial funding over a relatively short period (typically 3 years).
- Improved compliance will be seen in permitted parking places
- Growth in demand for vehicular access to South Somerset could be managed better due to active and regular enforcement
- The design of future parking schemes and schemes where the enforcement of the parking restrictions are paramount to the operational success can be undertaken in the knowledge that the parking controls would be enforced
- Bus priority networks would be able to be introduced in the knowledge that inconsiderate vehicle parking on such routes would be minimal
- Parking enforcement would become more locally accountable and adaptable
- Police resources, no matter how scarce they may appear, would be freed up and diverted to other purposes.

A4.5 It should be noted that whilst there is little doubt that contracting out the actual enforcement may work, contracting out the resulting administrative duties very often leads to poor performance and should South Somerset pursue DPE it would be prudent to keep these services in house. The poor performance of contractors carrying out the administrative duties is due to many factors such as a lack of skilled and fully trained administrative staff and insufficient resources being provided to comprehensively cover all the duties required. There has also been witnessed from other contracts which Project Centre has been involved in a high turnover of staff which leads to

inconsistency/lower quality of service, the draining of invested/local knowledge with the need to retrain new staff.

- A4.6 To address the major change in responsibilities arising from decriminalisation, a new parking management structure would be required. It should be responsible for all aspects of the operational management of parking in the district. The required service for parking management must include all aspects of on and off-street parking. There are several organisations that can carry out the enforcement service for the council should the decision be made to contract out.
- A4.7 A considerably larger parking administration section would need to be created, placing the responsibility of all aspects of the administration within the same overall day to day responsibility as the parking enforcement activities. As well as dealing with routine correspondence and payments, the administration team would have to incorporate the sensitive aspects of ticket processing, including dispatch of notices, the consideration of formal representations from aggrieved drivers, the interface to the independent adjudication system provided for within the legislation, the registration of debt at the county court and dealing with cases passed to a bailiff.
- A4.8 South Somerset District Council must participate in an independent appeal mechanism, known as adjudication service. The national parking adjudication service (NPAS) is the only available service for this purpose, so the council should join this joint committee. This service will meet the need to have a source of hearing for appeals, when the application for the powers is made to the DfT. The adjudication service functions as a S. 101 Joint Committee, so it will require elected members to formally represent the council at the infrequent (twice a year) committee meetings which are held. The cost of being a member of NPAS takes the form of a percentage of each case which NPAS hears. Section 101 (mentioned earlier in this paragraph) refers to section 101 to the Local Government Act 1972 which allows the principal authority (which in this case is South Somerset District Council) to ask another authority (being NPAS in this case) to discharge a function on its behalf, that function to act as an adjudication service for PCN appeals.
- A4.9 The Council's current IT system for the processing of parking tickets (if one exists) would need to undergo upgrading for the administration of Penalty Charge notices. From previous experience it is known that this is a significant undertaking, and should not be pursued without adequate skilled resources being applied to the project. Due to the large volumes of work which will be handled, the system will have to be configured to maximise staff productivity through investment in technology. South Somerset District Council will need to consider whether to procure a managed service under contract for the provision of all aspects of the IT services for parking. The provision of IT services

is an aspect where external organisations have far more experience of providing stable, complete service than the vast majority of in-house organisation could provide. Given the crucial role that this aspect of the project will play on the success of the whole project, South Somerset would have to have a very compelling reason not to out source this part of the project. Indeed many local authorities have externalised this aspect of the process on its own.

Geographic Area

- A4.10 One very important aspect, which South Somerset District Council needs to give consideration to, is the geographical extent that DPE will cover. Whilst there is a general opinion amongst police officers that entire administrative areas should be covered by DPE, the operational difficulties of attempting to cover remote/isolated settlements needs to be considered carefully before including these in the application to the Secretary of State.
- A4.11 There are certain external factors, which can be applied to the general discussion of where DPE can/should be applied. The police during the consultation process have the option of determining areas where they wish to see the regulation remain under their control. This could apply in sections of motorway and trunk roads, which go through or circle the larger towns within the South Somerset District. The SPA/PPA must include the councils off street locations where off street orders apply. This has the added advantage that the enforcement regime applied across the towns is uniform from a public perspective, and has a single procedure from the parking administration point of view.
- A4.12 In compiling the table below certain key assumptions have been made relating to certain operational aspects of the enforcement regime.
- There would be one operational base. Based in Yeovil. This assumption has been made on the basis that Yeovil will form the hub of the operation. It is by far the largest town in the district, it has the most restriction (both on street and off street) to enforce and operationally would be the best location in terms of liaison with other council departments. As the DPE area grows the council may well consider it viable to have more than one operational centre. Operational centres are expensive to set up and run (if paid for by the 'client') and the council needs to be sure that it is justified in terms of numbers of PA's that would use it and the areas/towns it covers needs a separate operations base from Yeovil.
 - South Somerset District would make the decision to have mobile patrols (use of scooters). For the smaller outlying towns it is crucial that the Parking Attendants (PA) have a measure of independent mobility to ensure regular enforcement takes place. Whilst it is possible to have a vehicle run to bring PA's to the

outlying towns, it still ties resources to transporting PA's from town to town and does not offer the flexibility to respond as efficiently as individual mobility to 'hot spot' enforcement action.

The key drivers for implementation phasing within a DPE operation would be (a) operational constraints, (b) financially viable (likelihood of ticket issues and sufficient restrictions to actually enforce) and (c) pressure on off & on-street provision.

Settlement	Remote (Y/N)	Sufficient restrictions (Y/N)	Financially viable (Y/N)	Pressure on capacity (on Street) “	Pressure on capacity (off street) “
Yeovil	N	Y	Y	Y*	Y
Chard	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Crewkerne	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ilminster	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wincanton	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bruton	N	N	Y**	N	Y
Castle Cary	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Langport	N	Y	N	N	N
Martock	N	N	N	N	N
Somerton	N	Y**	N	N	N
S.Petherton	N	N	N	N	N

“ greater than 85%

* due to large percentage of carriageway being restricted

** Borderline

A4.13 The above table, **which are the prevailing condition now**, provides a broad outline of where DPE would be viable given the parameters as stated in paragraph 3.3 above. Yeovil, Castle Cary, Chard, Crewkerne, Ilminster and Wincanton have the profile of areas where DPE would be viable. They have sufficient restrictions to justify having regular patrols, they are of the scale (size in terms of combined off street spaces and on street restrictions) to have regular patrols and there is sufficient pressure on the area to actively manage (not exclusively), the parking stock through regular enforcement. Bruton is borderline but given the relative remoteness, scale and pressure upon the existing parking stock it is not considered that regular patrols are viable. All other towns, given their present size, would not be able to support DPE in isolation given the present prevailing conditions. However, a phased implementation would allow surpluses to be built up so the whole account would not operate at a loss even though some of the smaller towns may do so.

Relations with the Police

A4.14 As the introduction of DPE is about the transfer of certain responsibilities from the police to the Council, it is important that good relationships are maintained between the two organisations throughout the life of the project. The police have to be formally consulted as an element of the application process, and although in theory their agreement to the process is not required, it would be a major failure if both parties were not to agree as to the nature and timing of the project.

A4.15 In such a project, there is usually an issue to be determined by the police regarding the future of the traffic wardens. The police have to determine if they intend to retain the wardens, or if they wish to re-deploy them internally, or make them redundant. In the latter circumstance, there may well be an issue of whether or not the wardens would be transferred to the council or its contractor and whether or not this would be under Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations (TUPE). TUPE is a mechanism by which employees can be transferred from one organisation to another. It offers protection rights for existing terms and conditions for transferring staff but these can also be negotiated between the new employer and trade union representatives.

In-house or contract out

A4.16 There are several key benefits to contracting out the enforcement service. The principle advantages are considered to be:-

- The contractor will provide some of the capital required; this can cover the main items required for DPE, as well as related items such as the renewal costs of signs and lines
- That a good contractor will have wealth of experience of this service; this means that the learning curve which the client side function of the operation will need to go through will take place with minimal problems in comparison to a local authority that will not have in place a contractor with the ability to provide previous experience and advice
- Councils generally find it easier to deal with a major TUPE exercise if there is a contractor in place.
- Contractors have good links to the IT system suppliers/installers and can provide a comprehensive IT service instead of the authority having to procure their IT separately with the subsequent demands of implementing and managing the system.
- The provision of short term resources for special events is much easier for a contractor; to provide additional staff for special events or seasonal peaks in parking profile.
- Contractor PA's tend to be more effective in terms of issuing parking tickets than Council employees

A4.17 There are also negative aspects to contracting out the service which come about as a result of poorly designed and run contracts. Should these issues not be dealt with effectively it can lead to an inflexible and

non responsive service. It is not likely that this will happen if for no other reason than the contractor will be keen to establish a good reputation in the area, especially if the county they are working in has other districts which are considering DPE.

A4.18 Many Councils have chosen to tender out the services associated with DPE, as they are frequently either new services, or considerable extensions of existing services. There is a very competitive market with several organisations able to provide exceptionally high quality enforcement services. This however should not be viewed as an endorsement of contracting out and it would be prudent to carry out a full and thorough review on the possibility of providing a fully in house operation.

A4.20 To contract out such a service will take the best part of a year allowing for the full EU procurement process with an additional 3 months for the contract set-up period after the contract is awarded. It would be one of the larger sub projects within the overall project, requiring specialist skills and experience to progress the preparation through to award.

A4.21 Experience of implementing other DPE projects has revealed that contracting out is not necessarily the most cost effective manner of providing the service. It needs to be remembered that there has to be a financial incentive for any external contractor to carry out the enforcement throughout the district and it is likely to cost the Council more to have the PA's through a contractor rather than employ them directly. There may possibly be initial benefits of better cashflow and broader revenue streams but these benefits are difficult to identify. Although tender costs in one set of circumstances can never be applied to another with any degree of certainty, it is likely that a contract would cost South Somerset the same if not more than an in-house operation. The actual hourly charge per PA that South Somerset receives though the invoices from a contractor will be reflective of the overheads, hourly wage and profit that the contractor will have applied to the contract. Whilst the margins can be quite low and may not seem particularly high, these figures, applied to all the PA's necessary to cover the enforcement duties of the area combined with the longevity of the contract (usually 3 or 5 years with a 2 year extension option) can lead to a significant sum over the life of the contract.

A4.22 There are currently two main types of enforcement contract:-

Labour supply, where a contractor provides a number of skilled operatives who are deployed wherever the Council believe to be appropriate; or

frequency of visits based, where the council defines in advance the level of enforcement with the flexibility to cope with peaks and troughs that occur throughout the year.

A4.23 The Council can also, outside the main duties of the contract, ask the contractor to undertake duties such as providing hand held ticket issuing equipment, check car parks and the functionality of ticket machines and report any that are not functioning correctly.

Car Park Charges

A4.24 The issue of the levels of charges applied in off-street areas is not directly affected by DPE. Having said this, the question of the opportunity to ensure the charges are in line with the market, as recommended by the audit commission. There is also the issue of the effect of increased and whether the current strategy for long term parking charges in car parks is reflective of the long term policies the council has in place.

A4.25 The off-street places are likely to receive a higher level of demand after DPE is introduced. This phenomenon has been noted in every area where DPE has been introduced. It will be necessary to review the current tariff and possibly introduce differential charges between car parks in fairly close proximity as this will assist in managing the excess demand on certain car parks.

Clamping and Removals

A4.26 It is believed the police in South Somerset do not currently clamp. There is no evidence to suggest that they carry out removals of vehicles except in very exceptional circumstances. The parking problems that South Somerset currently have does not justify the need for these measures at present. Most local authorities believe the more prudent course of action is to hold these facilities in abeyance for 12-18 months after the operational start date and then make a decision. However, **the powers** to undertake clamping and removal must be sought in the application. They can be bought into use at any time in the future should a policy on the use be developed. The principle driver for this is usually a significant increase in non-compliance but in all likelihood the compliance levels will increase once drivers see regular enforcement patrols. This has happened in virtually every area where DPE has been introduced and there is no reason to believe this will not be the case in South Somerset.

A4.27 It is worth noting that several large authorities who have commenced their own enforcement have come to the conclusion that a certain amount of towing is necessary. This is particularly true of cities that have 'regular' special events such as football clubs with large attendances, street festivals and other celebrations during the year (particularly in the summer months). One particular City Council considers the deterrent so important that the removal operation operates at a loss.

- A4.28 Both clamping and removals, but the latter in particular, require a large initial investment and high on costs to make them operate. There is a need for 24 hour operation to release vehicles, a secure pound and payment facilities. Because of these aspects the Council would find such services expensive and contractors would be unlikely to provide the service as the financial viability would be considered dubious. However, as mentioned previously, the Council may require this service as a deterrent but should do so in the full knowledge that it will, in all likelihood, operate at a loss.
- A4.29 During the discussions with police, which will be part of the on-going consultation process, South Somerset should investigate the possibility of using the police network of contractors to act in cases of dangerous obstruction. Whilst this agreement has been reached by other authorities around the country, it should be remembered that the police will be seeking to scale down their operations and the level of service that can be expected, if they agree, will be patchy at best.
- A4.30 Should the Council wish to have a clamping operation, they will need to formulate a policy for their use. However, clamping should *not* be considered, as it will appear heavy handed. It needs to be borne in mind that most drivers in South Somerset will not have been subject to regular enforcement and the perception will be one of heavy handedness. It may well transpire that there are exceptional cases where clamping action is appropriate. Such cases may include Persistent offenders (i.e. those who have no regard of the regulations but actually pay the PCN. It may well be that they consider the cost to be an 'occupational risk' of their behaviour). Persistent offenders also come into the category of 'clamping appropriate'. This category of driver regularly flouts the regulations and do not pay the subsequent PCN's they receive. It should be noted that this is only partially effective as the regulations do not allow local authorities to keep a vehicle clamped until all outstanding PCN's are paid. Vehicles in this category are almost certainly not registered to the current keeper but the message is made clear that such behaviour will not be tolerated. The importance of respect for the restrictions cannot be over stated. It does not take long for restrictions to fall into disrepute due to illegal parking actions by a select minority. The clamping of a vehicle also sends out a very visible message as the vehicle stays in situ until such time that it is released.

Functions of the Operation

- A4.31 The functions which will be necessary for a co-ordinated and comprehensive parking operation will be:

Income

- Postal receipts of PCN payments

- Personal payments
- Telephone payments
- Internet payments
- Permit applications and payments

Administration

- PCN processing
- Correspondence management
- Telephone enquiries
- DVLA interaction
- Consideration of appeals
- Adjudication preparation
- County court interaction (debt collection)
- Permit, suspensions and IT management

A4.32 This assumes that other functions such as cash collection from car park payment equipment, car park security and cleaning will remain within the existing contract arrangements.

Consultation

A4.33 The need for consultation falls into two main sections; there is a need for formal consultation as an aspect of the preparation of the SPA/PPA Application and there is need for less formal consultation with interest groups and the public at large over the introduction of the measures. The former requirement has to be completed in time for the submission of the Application, and should include the Police as described above, the neighbouring authorities, the Highway Agency, Fire Service and other such bodies who may be considered to have an interest in the possible change in enforcement.

A4.34 The consultation with other organisations, such as residents groups, and Chamber of Commerce will be determined by the policy of the Council in involving other groups in such matters. In several cases, authorities have proceeded with little or no consultation at this level, while others have gone to considerable lengths to inform and involve the community. General experience is that DPE on its own is usually either a strong view that “more enforcement” is required, or it stems from particular sections of the community who perceive it as a threat e.g. retail operators who think more enforcement will damage trade. It is often difficult to differentiate DPE from other parking related matters, such as increased charges, or availability of space in resident areas.

A4.35 The other aspect of the less formal consultation is really the need to inform people more generally what the implementation of DPE means to them, and to warn them about what is going to happen and when. This can often be achieved by quite low cost measures such as leafleting households, articles in Council magazines, RAC/AA sign – posting on the main access routes to the City, and putting Warning

Notices on illegally parked vehicles in the 2 weeks prior to the commencement. It is also very helpful to try to get information releases out to the media, but to do so in a manner which explains the changes, and attempts to gain a degree of understanding, if not accord, with such organisations. Ensuring that members and senior officers are fully briefed, and understand both the issues and Council policy are also simple but effective measures, which can be taken. South Somerset should give serious consideration to a complete PR campaign, which should be designed at an early stage then implemented, particularly in the last few months before the start date.

A brief to Consultants on the objectives of the emerging South Somerset District Wide Parking Strategy and outputs required from a Public Car Parking Study.

Introduction

South Somerset District Council (SSDC) wish to undertake a study into public car parking in Yeovil and other towns in the District in order to inform and generate production of a District Wide Car Parking Strategy. The purpose of this brief is to outline the objectives and desired outputs required from the emerging South Somerset District Wide Parking Strategy, to enable consultants to submit a detailed method statement.

The Parking Strategy includes all Towns and Rural Centres as defined in the Local Plan, but excludes Bruton and Milborne Port on scale grounds. The towns included are therefore as follows: Yeovil, Chard, Crewkerne, Ilminster, Castle Cary, Wincanton, Martock, Somerton, Langport, and South Petherton. The Strategy should also include any relevant edge of centre parking zones.

This brief looks at public off-street parking including those provided by private operators and on-street parking provision. Private non-operational off-street provision and any reference to Travel Plans are deliberately excluded.

A DDA audit has been undertaken to make adequate provision for those with disabilities and provisional agreement has now been outlined with the South Somerset Disability Forum (SSDF) on its conclusions.

The Yeovil Vision will identify sites that have potential for decking and redevelopment.

Provisional Objectives of emerging Strategy

1. Work towards a more balanced and sustainable transport system with increased emphasis on enabling a choice of transport and reducing traffic congestion.
2. Protect and enhance the vitality and viability of Yeovil and market towns and rural centres.
3. To make appropriate provision for respective users:
 - Commuters
 - Residents
 - Leisure
 - Shoppers
 - All other visitors

And to manage that provision recognising potential conflict amongst users and in context to clause 1) above.

4. To assess highway implications, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Yeovil Vision with regard to the potential for decking and/or redevelopment and demand projections.
5. To allow any such identified appropriate development on selected town centre car parks to contribute towards regeneration.
6. To improve accessibility to town centres enabling users easy access to car parks devoid of undue traffic congestion impacting on both pedestrians and car users.
7. To provide fit for purpose car parks that improve provision and access in terms of security and safety.
8. Secure and safe cycle and motorcycle provision.
9. Meet Air Quality Management issues.
10. Encourage interchange to enable mode shift.
11. Eliminate the disparity between parking charges and bus fares.
12. Maximise revenue from car parking provision.
13. Managed enforced on-street parking to avoid displacement and congestion issues whilst providing for residents.
14. To ensure that Yeovil, the market towns and rural centres remain competitive with regional and sub-regional neighbours.

Outputs sought from Public Car Parking Study

To enable SSDC to develop policy and resolve potential conflicts we need to identify and establish:

10. The current patterns and trends in parking. This will require an establishment of demand and supply at present for public parking both on and off street.
11. Quantification of how demand will evolve up to 2016 i.e. projection of future demand and supply.
12. Develop a modelling tool to operate at different objective scenarios to enable the authority to establish the balanced strategy it seeks. In particular to test a range of car parking supply and charges and run the modelling to evaluate the practicality of the main policy objectives.
13. To identify potential for influencing and achieving modal shift away from the car towards more sustainable transport modes, including public transport, thereby enabling greater choice.
14. To evaluate the practicality of Park & Ride in Yeovil by 2016. (Starting from a recent Park & Ride feasibility study that indicated Park & Ride was not currently viable)
15. To establish the elasticities of demand and how car parking charges impact on that, taking car parking costs into account and establishing a maximum car parking revenue.

16. To identify those Car Park sites in Areas East, West & North with potential for decking and/or development and how demand, as assessed within outputs 2 & 3 above, can be met to replace any sites where the priority is determined as redevelopment rather than parking. (This work is already evolving in Area South through the Yeovil Urban Development Framework).
17. "The enforcement regime necessary (type of on street restriction and the level and nature of actual enforcement) to achieve the provisional objectives of the emerging Strategy and in particular objective 6.
18. Ensure the reasonable competitiveness of our car parking charges.

The Council seeks submissions in relation to the above indicating the appropriate methodology to be used, and the timescale and outputs associated with these methodologies. The Council desires the outputs as soon as practicable and certainly by the year-end.

Data Sources

It is expected that this submission will present the relevant data sources, both published and original survey material as required, to be used as part of the methodology put forward.

Reporting

1. Approximately four weeks in advance of the deadline, the consultants shall submit a draft study to the District Council for consideration.
2. The District Council will send comments on the draft study to the Consultants within two weeks of its receipt.
3. Bound copies of the final Study shall be presented to the District Council. As well as a copy that is suitable for photocopying. An electronic copy of the study, suitable for CD Rom and hosting on the Council's website, should also be provided.
4. If requested by the District Council, the consultants should provide an expert witness to appear at Examinations of development plan documents, at a fee structure to be agreed by the parties at the time of appointment of the consultants.

Fees

Fees are to be agreed between the District Council and the consultants before any appointment is made. The fee must be comprehensive, and cover all aspects of the brief. It will be payable on receipt of an acceptable final study.

Copyright

The copyright shall be vested in the District Council, but the research shall be attributed to the successful bidder. The consultants shall not make available any information or findings to a third party without the express consent of the District Council.

Appendix 6

Existing Tariffs

CAR PARK/CATEGORY	CHARGES 2006	SEASON TICKETS (Quarterly)
SHORT STAY- CHARD Bath Street Essex Close	30p for one hour 40p for two hours 60p for three hours £1.40 for four hours. £2.00 all day	NO NO
MEDIUM STAY – CHARD Boden Street	30p for one hour 40p for two hours 60p for three hours £1.40 all day	£50
MEDIUM/LONG STAY – CHARD Market Field Combe Street The Minnows	40p for two hours £1.10 all day	£30 £30 £30
LONG STAY-CHARD Crowshute	70p all day £1.00 all day coach parking	£25
SHORT STAY – CREWKERNE South Street	30p for one hour 40p for two hours 60p for three hours £1.40 for four hours £2.00 all day. Resident Coach and Lorry £2.00	£35
MEDIUM/LONG STAY- CREWKERNE Abbey Street West Street	30p for one hour 40p for two hours £1.10 all day	£35 £35
Market Square	Free ½ hour parking	
MEDIUM/LONG STAY- ILMINSTER Shudrick Lane Orchard Vale	30p for one hour 40p for two hours £1.10 all day	£35 Std / £25 Res £18
LONG STAY – ILMINSTER West Street	30p for one hour 40p for two hours 70p all day	£18

CAR PARK / CATEGORY Yeovil	CHARGES 2006	Season Ticket (Quarterly)
SHORT STAY Peter Street South Street Market South Street Park Street	80p per hour One hour maximum stay	NO
Newton Road	80p for one hour £1.20 for two hours. Two hours maximum stay	NO
MEDIUM STAY Court Ash Petters Way Box Factory West Hendford North Lane	£1.00 for two hours £1.20 for three hours £1.00 each subsequent hour. £1.00 for two hours £1.20 for three hours Three Hours maximum stay	NO £300 £300 NO NO
Goldenstones Short Stay Area Long Stay Area	80p for three hours Three hours maximum stay. £1.60 all day	NO
MEDIUM/LONG STAY Stars Lane West Earle Street	£1.00 for two hours £1.20 for three hours £1.60 for four hours £2.40 all day	£150 £150
LONG STAY Brunswick Street Fairfield Market Street Huish Goldcroft Mill Lane	£1.60 all day £1.30 Saturdays	£80 £80 £80 £80 £80 NO
PERMIT ONLY Huish Old Pool	N/A	£150

Appendix 7

Car Park Locations

See related media to the right of the web page