



## **CABINET - 28TH NOVEMBER 2018**

**SUBJECT:        DECRIMINALISATION OF PARKING - RESIDENTS' PARKING  
                  AMENDMENT ORDER 2018**

**REPORT BY:     INTERIM CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITIES**

---

---

### **1.        PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1       Cabinet agreed as part of the Decriminalisation of Parking Stage 2 report on 25 July 2018 that all parking permits should be brought in line in accordance with the policy previously agreed by Cabinet on 31 July 2012. Following advertisement of the proposed changes to the residents' parking schemes across the Borough there have been a significant number of comments received. The report outlines the comments received and the options available for Cabinets further consideration.

### **2.        SUMMARY**

2.1       The proposals are to amend the existing residents' permit parking schemes across the Borough by the implementation of the following changes:

- a)        A charge of £30 per permit per annum.
- b)        A maximum of two permits per qualifying property can be issued, of which one permit can be designated as a visitor permit.
- c)        To allow the issue of business permits where considered appropriate and supported by ward members (at a charge of £75 per permit per annum).

2.2       These proposals would bring the existing resident permit parking schemes in line with the Councils policy that was adopted in 2012. The proposals would be consolidated under a Traffic Regulation Order in preparation for the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement in April 2019.

### **3.        LINKS TO STRATEGY**

3.1       The proposals contribute to the following Well-being Goals within the Well-being of Future Generations Act (Wales) 2015:

- A prosperous Wales
- A resilient Wales
- A healthier Wales
- A more equal Wales
- A Wales of cohesive communities

3.2       Engineering Services Division Objective: To work towards a safer environment though positive measures to reduce road accidents and particularly by protecting and providing for vulnerable road users.

- 3.3 The proposals will contribute to the Authority's Well Being Objective 4: Promote a modern, integrated and sustainable transport system that increases opportunity, promotes prosperity and minimises the adverse impacts on the environment.

#### 4. THE REPORT

- 4.1 The Council has recently commenced the process to obtain Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) powers to enable the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions within the Borough to be carried out by the local Authority. It is proposed that this enforcement function will transfer from Gwent Police to the Council on the 8th April 2019. Details of the proposal are detailed in the Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting on 25th July 2018.
- 4.2 As part of this process, a consolidation exercise is currently being undertaken to ensure all parking restrictions within the Borough are enforceable and supported by the required legal Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).
- 4.3 Consideration has been given to the existing residents' only permit parking schemes in Abercarn, Bargoed, Blackwood, Caerphilly, Risca, Newbridge, Rhymney and Ystrad Mynach. Since their inception, the existing schemes have operated under differing criteria. In order to ensure consistency and equality across the County, and to ensure effective enforcement can be carried out, it is now considered necessary to bring all existing schemes in line with the Council's approved resident permit parking policy. Details of the approved policy can be reviewed in the minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 31st July 2012.
- 4.4 There are currently 1661 properties that are eligible for a resident parking permit across the Borough and 1384 live permits.
- 4.5 Within neighbouring Authorities, the following criteria / charges apply:
- Merthyr Tydfil:  
Maximum of two permits per property of which one may be a visitor permit  
£34 per permit per annum.
  - Rhondda Cynon Taf:  
One permit per property, with any additional permits being issued following consideration of the capacity of an individual zone and / or any relevant individual or local circumstances.  
1st permit £10 per annum.  
2nd permit £15 per annum.  
Subsequent additional permits (if capacity allows) £50 per annum.
  - Newport:  
Maximum of two permits per property.  
£17 per permit per annum.
  - Cardiff:  
Maximum of two resident permits and one visitor permit per property.  
1st permit £7.50 per annum.  
2nd permit £30 per annum.  
Visitor permit (in addition to residents permit) £30 per annum.  
Visitor permit only £7.50 annum.
  - Blaenau Gwent and Torfaen:  
No resident permit schemes in operation.

## 4.6 Options for Consideration

4.6.1 In view of the significant level of objection received, as detailed in Appendix A (143 formal objections and 2 petitions containing 345 signatories), Cabinet is asked to consider the possible options outlined below and detailed in Section 4.7:

1. Status Quo to remain (not progress the Order).
2. Adopt the approved policy approach (progress the Order as advertised).
3. Adopt the approved policy with a lesser charge (amend the advertised Order).
4. Amend the proposal to change the number of permits per property with a lesser charge (not progress the Order and re-advertise new Order).

4.6.2 Cabinet is asked to consider the following issues and implications of each of these options.

## 4.7 Implications of the options

### 4.7.1 **Option 1: Status Quo to remain (not progress the Order)**

- A number of residents are satisfied with the current arrangements which have been in place for many years.
- There is a lack of consistency/equality across the Borough in terms of the number of permits issued and this option would not address this situation.
- This option would generate no income to contribute towards the administration and management of the scheme.
- There would be no requirement to re-advertise the proposals or amend the policy.

### 4.7.2 **Option 2: Adopt the approved policy approach (progress the Order as advertised)**

- This would generate an income stream to cover administration and management of the scheme.
- This option would ensure consistency and equality of provision across the Borough in terms of the number of permits issued.
- A significant number of residents have objected to the level of charge.
- There would be no requirement to re-advertise the proposals or amend the policy.

### 4.7.3 **Option 3: Adopt the approved policy with a lesser charge (amend the advertised Order)**

- This option would ensure consistency and equality of provision across the Borough in terms of the number of permits issued.
- A significant number of residents have objected to the charge, though a lesser charge could address a proportion of these complaints.
- This would generate a reduced income stream, compared to Option 2, to contribute towards administration and management of the scheme.
- There would be no requirement to re-advertise the proposals or amend the policy.

### 4.7.4 **Option 4: Amend the proposal to change the number of permits per property with a lesser charge (not progress the Order and re-advertise new Order)**

- This option would generate a reduced income stream, compared to Option 2, to contribute towards administration and management of the scheme.
- It would require the approved policy to be reviewed and amended (in accordance with the Councils procedures and constitution) and re-advertisement of the amended proposals. It would not be possible to implement the proposals within the required timescales i.e. prior to CPE coming into force. If the decision is taken to proceed with this option, then the proposals and policy review would need to be deferred until after April 2019.

## 5. WELL-BEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS

5.1 This proposal contributes to the Well-being Goals as set out in Links to Strategy above. It is consistent with the five ways of working as defined within the sustainable development principle in the Act in that:

- **Long Term** – The proposed charge will contribute towards the funding of the scheme ensuring it is financially viable in the long term, thereby providing a link to a more resilient Wales.
- **Prevention** – A consistent approach across the borough will help the Council carry out effective and efficient enforcement, thereby providing a link to a more resilient Wales.
- **Integration** – The consolidation of existing residents' parking schemes is an integral part of CPE, thereby providing a link to a more equal and prosperous Wales.
- **Collaboration / Involvement** – The process seeks to involve residents in order to implement a pragmatic parking scheme and contribute towards a cohesive community.

## 6. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 An EIA screening has been completed in accordance with the Council's Strategic Equality Plan and supplementary guidance. No potential for unlawful discrimination and/or low level or minor negative impact has been identified therefore a full EIA has not been carried out.
- 6.2 All operational work concerning parking restrictions are undertaken following the publication of the proper orders, allowing for objections to be made by local residents. Any negative impact on individuals or groups raised at that point would be considered in the final decision.

## 7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 No changes are required on the ground. However, remedial works to lines and signs is being funded from the CPE implementation budget. The costs of processing the TRO are being met from the existing Traffic Management budget.

## 8. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 Additional resources will be required in order to administer the new residents' parking scheme, however this will be incorporated within the new structure of the Traffic Management and Parking Services team.

## 9. CONSULTATIONS

- 9.1 The proposals were consulted upon in accordance with the Councils approved procedure:
- The following ward members were consulted:
    - Cllr Carol Andrews, Cllr Tudor Davies, Cllr Dianne Price, Cllr Kevin Etheridge, Cllr Nigel Dix, Cllr Andrew Farina-Childs, Cllr Phil Bevan, Cllr Shayne Cook, Cllr James Pritchard, Cllr Adrian Hussey, Cllr Leeroy Jeremiah, Cllr Gary Johnston, Cllr James Fussell, Cllr Colin Elsbury, Cllr Stephen Kent, Cllr Carl Cuss, Cllr Alan Angel, Cllr Martyn James, Cllr Bob Owen, Cllr Ross Whiting, Cllr John Bevan and Cllr David Harse the local ward Members for Bargoed, Blackwood, Morgan Jones, Newbridge, St Martins, Twyn Carno, Ystrad Mynach, Risca West and Moriah and Cllr Sean Morgan Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economy, Infrastructure, Sustainability and Wellbeing of Future Generations Champion were contacted by e-mail on the 26 July 2018. An objection was received from Cllr Kevin Etheridge.

- Statutory Consultees including the Chief Constable of Gwent Police, South Wales Fire and Rescue Service, Welsh Ambulance Services NHS Trust, the Road Haulage Association and the Freight Transport Association were contacted by e-mail on the 27 July 2018. No objections were received.
- Caerphilly Town Council, Bargoed Town Council and Blackwood Town Council were consulted on the 27 July 2018. No objections were received at that time. Bargoed Town Council later advised that they did not recall receiving the original consultation email, were re-consulted and an objection was received.
- Ystrad Mynach and Newbridge Community Partnerships were consulted on the 18 September 2018. No objections were received.

9.2 The Notice detailing the above proposals was advertised for Public consultation on the 30 August 2018. The proposed Traffic Regulation Order was placed on deposit with CCBC legal section for public scrutiny following advertisement of the Notice.

9.3 A copy of the advertised Notice and a letter detailing the proposals were sent to the 1661 properties currently eligible to apply for a residents' permit and notices were erected on the affected streets.

9.4 As a result of public advertisement, a total of 143 letters and emails, and two petitions were received (10 of the letters/emails received were from objectors residing outside the residents parking areas). This includes objections received from Cllr James Pritchard, Cllr Shayne Cook, Cllr Martyn James and Caerphilly Town Council. A summary of the main grounds and reasons for objection, the number of objectors to each point and the Council's response are summarised in Appendix A. The petitions contained 345 signatories objecting to charging for permits (of which 87 gave their location as outside CCBCs resident parking areas). Formal letters of objection were received from less than 10% of eligible properties.

## **10. CONCLUSIONS**

10.1 As a result of the objections/comments received it is important that Cabinet considers the options detailed in section 4.6 and 4.7 above.

10.2 It is also important to note that there are implications for the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process and timetable which vary for each option.

10.3 Having considered the number and nature of the objections received combined with the legalities and practicalities associated with the TRO process, it is the view of officers that Option 2 (adopt the approved policy approach) with a lesser charge of £15 per permit per annum should be introduced. This will not then require re-advertisement of the proposals or amendment to the Council policy that was adopted in 2012.

## **11. RECOMMENDATIONS**

11.1 Cabinet is asked to consider the content of the report, the objection details and data in Appendix A and the recommendation of officers set out in 10.3 above and to agree which option should be implemented.

## **12. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

12.1 To ensure consistency and equality of provision across the Borough in terms of the application of the adopted resident permit parking policy and the number of permits issued.

### **13. STATUTORY POWER**

#### 13.1 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Authors: Rachel Hurn, Assistant Engineer, Traffic Management  
Clive Campbell – Transportation Engineering Manager

Consultees: Cllr Sean Morgan - Cabinet Member for Economy, Infrastructure, Sustainability and Wellbeing of Future Generations Champion  
Mark S Williams – Interim Director of Communities  
Marcus Lloyd – Head of Infrastructure  
Robert Tranter – Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer  
Nicole Scammell - Head of Corporate Finance and S151 Officer  
Dean Smith – Principal Engineer (Traffic Management)  
Anwen Cullinane – Senior Policy Officer (Equalities and Welsh Language)  
Shaun Watkins – Principal Personnel Officer  
Mike Eedy – Finance Manager

Appendices:  
Appendix A Summary of objections received following Public Notice

## APPENDIX A

On 24<sup>th</sup> August 2018, a total of 1661 letters were sent to all eligible properties detailing the proposed amendments to the residents permit parking scheme across the Borough. The proposals were also advertised in the press and notices were erected on site in all affected streets. As a result, a total of 143 letters and emails, and two petitions were received (10 of the letters/emails received were from objectors residing outside the residents parking areas). Formal letters of objection were received from less than 10% of eligible properties.

It should be noted that objections were received from Caerphilly Town Council, Bargoed Town Council, Cllr James Pritchard, Cllr Shayne Cook, Cllr Kevin Etheridge and Cllr Martyn James.

A summary of the main grounds and reasons for objection, and the numbers of objections to each point are summarised below:

In addition to the objections detailed below, 345 petition signatories objected to charging for permits (of which 87 gave their location as outside CCBCs resident parking areas)

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO OF OBJECTORS	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE
Request designated / guaranteed parking space per property	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each property should have a space marked outside for their sole use so that the elderly or parents weighed down with shopping and young children would be guaranteed a space outside their own home</li> <li>Individual bays should be marked out to prevent vehicles taking more than one space</li> <li>Elderly people will be forced to park further from their properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This would be an impractical and inefficient use of the highway as not all residents own a car and it is not possible to provide a space outside all eligible properties.</li> <li>As vehicles vary in length, this would be an inefficient use of the available space.</li> <li>It is the norm for residents parking schemes to operate on a first come, first served basis as there can be no guarantee of a parking space.</li> </ul>
Increased enforcement needed	57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-residents currently park illegally in the residents' bays all day. If residents have to pay to park, this must be stopped</li> <li>Increased enforcement is required to ensure parking is available for residents</li> <li>Current enforcement is 'willy nilly' – bays will need to be policed regularly</li> <li>Would be happy to pay for a permit if restrictions were enforced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gwent Police are currently responsible for the enforcement of all parking restrictions on the public highway. However, the Council intends to take on Civil Parking Enforcement in April 2018 which will enable more focused allocation of resources to the enforcement of parking restrictions as and when necessary.</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO OF OBJECTORS	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents from the local school park illegally in the street which needs enforcement action to be carried out</li> <li>• Increased enforcement will generate more money</li> <li>• Additional enforcement will allow use of garage as currently resident cannot use due to obstructive parking</li> <li>• Additional enforcement unlikely to be enough to prevent illegal parking. Numbers of staff should be increased beyond that proposed in the Cabinet report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of resources and their effectiveness will be monitored following the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement.</li> </ul>
Object to any charge	41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional financial burden being placed on motorists</li> <li>• Resident lives in a deprived area, but the Council is looking to make more money from those who can ill afford it</li> <li>• Unhappy with proposed 'tax' on resident</li> <li>• Elderly residents unable to afford charge</li> <li>• Charging for permits will not impact road safety, traffic flow or result in a reduction in obstructions for road users</li> <li>• Will put people further into poverty and distress – many members of the community are unable to utilise public transport due to poor physical and mental health</li> <li>• Should continue as a free benefit to residents as has been custom and practice since the inception of the scheme</li> <li>• Residents will look for unrestricted parking rather than pay the charge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents parking schemes are provided to assist residents of a particular area where specific problems exist, but are costly to install, maintain and administer. Therefore, the charges are necessary in order to contribute towards these costs.</li> <li>• Residents parking schemes are implemented to assist residents to park in close proximity to their homes which should benefit those with poor mental and physical health.</li> <li>• Due to the financial saving the Council needs to meet, it is no longer possible to provide such schemes for no charge as there is a cost to manage and administer the scheme.</li> <li>• Noted. It is also acknowledged that those residents with more than two vehicles will need to find alternative parking, as is the case now.</li> </ul>



SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO OF OBJECTORS	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough spaces available, so residents will have to pay, but still not be able to park</li> <li>• Charging for residents permits is not a fair way to increase Council revenue</li> <li>• Elderly may become isolated if they are unable to afford the cost of a visitors permit</li> <li>• Properties with no rear lane or possibility of providing off-street parking will be forced to pay the charge as they will have no alternative</li> <li>• Charges should be made to the non-residents who use the 1 hour limited waiting bays, not the residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the norm for residents parking schemes to operate on a first come, first served basis. It is acknowledged that it is not possible to park two cars within the frontage of most terraced properties. However, not all residents own a vehicle, and not all permit holders will be parked at the same time. Therefore, two permits per property would maximise the use of the available space. With increased enforcement, residents should have a greater opportunity to find an available space.</li> <li>• The charge would not increase Council revenue, but contribute towards the running costs of the scheme.</li> <li>• As with the current scheme visitors would have the option of using alternative parking or means of transport.</li> <li>• Residents would have the option of finding alternative parking.</li> <li>• There are currently no proposals to introduce pay and display for on-street parking at the present time.</li> </ul>
Request for reduced cost	48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost is for administration and maintenance and is disproportionate to infrastructure that is currently in place</li> <li>• Cost is too high compared to neighbouring authorities</li> <li>• Excessive cost will adversely impact the elderly and low-income families</li> <li>• Elderly may become isolated if they are unable to afford the cost of a visitors permit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In view of the concerns raised, members are asked to consider the options detailed in paragraph 7 of the report.</li> </ul>
Only second permit should be chargeable	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First permit should be free. Residents would then have the option of paying for a second permit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has determined that a charge will need to be made for both permits. However, in view of the concerns raised members are asked to consider the options detailed in paragraph 7 of the report</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO OF OBJECTORS	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE
Increase in number of dedicated bays required	52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bays allow free non-resident parking for 1 hour, if residents have to pay for permits, this option should be removed</li> <li>• Unrestricted parking within affected streets should be made residents only</li> <li>• Additional car park areas should be created for residents where land is available</li> <li>• Many spaces are taken up by disabled badge holders</li> <li>• All bays within the town centre should allow residents to park (including those that are currently limited waiting only)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shared resident parking and limited waiting arrangements maximises the use of the available space of the highway during the daytime when there is most likely to be availability.</li> <li>• Any requests for changes to be made to the existing on-street parking bays can be considered following the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement.</li> <li>• The Council endeavours to maximise the parking opportunity for local residents and shoppers etc. on the public highway and also supports the provision of off-street parking facilities where this would alleviate congestion problems or provide a social/economic benefit to the local community. The merits of any new car park facility has to be balanced against the available budgets at the time and, unfortunately, in the current financial climate the Council does not have monies available to create a new car park facility.</li> <li>• The Council acknowledges this, however, disabled badge holders are exempt from the restriction.</li> <li>• Any requests for changes to be made to the existing on-street parking bays can be considered following the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement.</li> </ul>
Permits should only be valid in one street	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents from individual streets should only be able to park in that street, not other streets within the zone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to maximise the opportunity for residents to be able to park near their homes, schemes operate on a zonal basis.</li> </ul>
Consider strategy to encourage more drivers to utilise public car parks	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workers should be offered incentives to utilise the car parks</li> <li>• Parents should be given free parking at school times within the pay and display car park near the schools</li> <li>• Parking should be free within Blackwood Town to discourage drivers from using residential streets to park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be considered as part of a future review of parking facilities within the Borough.</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO OF OBJECTORS	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents should be given the opportunity to purchase a reduced rate car park season ticket which is valid for school times only</li> <li>Fees should be used to provide extra parking facilities for local schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The charge would not increase Council revenue, but contribute towards the running costs of the scheme.</li> </ul>
Business permits should not be issued	49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No requirement for businesses to park all day in residents bays as there is sufficient space for loading and unloading</li> <li>Further clarification is required as to the issue of business permits</li> <li>There is sufficient space within the town centre car parks for business owners</li> <li>Concerns over commercial vehicles and large vans parking in the residential streets</li> <li>Increased on-street parking by business owners would be detrimental to footfall in the town centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of businesses are expected to park their vehicles elsewhere. Business permits will only be considered when there is an evidenced need for a business to park its delivery vehicle in close proximity to their premises (e.g. a florist or butcher). A business permit would not be issued for general staff parking. Each application would be considered on its merits in consultation with the local Councillors and is not an automatic entitlement. It is anticipated that a very small number of business permits would be issued.</li> </ul>
Business permits should be higher cost	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At £75pa, business owners are being encouraged to park on-street rather than in the car parks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above.</li> </ul>
Opposition to anything the Council wishes to implement following the colossal mismanagement of the Cedar Tree Roundabout	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Objections to future schemes will be considered on their merits.</li> </ul>
Third permit should be made available (where there is a disability need)	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blue badge holders are exempt from the residents parking restrictions.</li> </ul>
Carers should have free permits	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No provision for carers of the elderly or infirm (including family carers)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration will be given to issuing permits for paid carers only, family carers can be covered by a visitor permit.</li> </ul>
Request for complete removal of scheme (St Martins Road, Caerphilly)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents' parking no longer required following closure of the Miner's Hospital</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any requests for changes to be made to the existing on-street parking bays can be considered following the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement.</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO OF OBJECTORS	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE
Request for complete removal of scheme (Bristol Terrace, Bargoed)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents parking not required in Bristol Terrace as too far from town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any requests for changes to be made to the existing on-street parking bays can be considered following the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement.</li> </ul>
Request for complete removal of scheme (Central Street, Ystrad Mynach)	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any requests for changes to be made to the existing on-street parking bays can be considered following the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement.</li> </ul>
Number of permits should be limited to one per property	Caerphilly – 1 Blackwood – 34 Bargoed - 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Terraced streets can only accommodate one vehicle per property</li> <li>Residents will be forced to pay for something that cannot be delivered and will be a ‘parking lottery’ and number of permits will grossly outnumber available space</li> <li>Even with the restriction of one permit per property, it is sometimes impossible to park in the street</li> <li>Elderly people would be forced to park further from their properties if the number of permits issued increases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is the norm for residents parking schemes to operate on a first come, first served basis. It is acknowledged that it is not possible to park two cars within the frontage of most terraced properties. However, not all residents own a vehicle, and not all permit holders will be parked at the same time. Therefore, two permits per property would maximise the use of the available space thereby balancing provision between number of permits issued, demand and available road space. With increased enforcement, residents should have a greater opportunity to find an available space.</li> </ul>
Number of permits should be unlimited	Caerphilly – 5 Ystrad Mynach – 2 Bargoed - 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A limit on the number of permits will create unnecessary animosity between residents</li> <li>Children are living with their parents longer due to house prices and will be prevented from having a car if both parents have a permit</li> <li>Would be happy to pay a higher fee for a third permit</li> <li>Limiting to a maximum of two permits per property may put off potential buyers - families with older children would not consider buying a property with such restrictions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above.</li> </ul>
Resident parking should be 24 hours per day	Caerphilly – 1 Ystrad Mynach – 3 Blackwood – 2 Bargoed - 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If residents have to pay for a permit, the scheme should be in operation 24 hours per day, so non-residents cannot park there at any time</li> <li>There are no parking issues in the daytime – issues occur in the evening when residents come home from work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents parking schemes should only apply for the periods when the problems of non-resident parking exists. Any requests for changes to be made to the existing on-street parking bays can be considered following the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement.</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO OF OBJECTORS	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be happy to pay for a permit if it covered the evenings</li> <li>• Nowhere to park if returning home from work late</li> <li>• Local scout hall causes parking problems in the evenings</li> </ul>	
Reduce Council tax to compensate for the permit fee	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council tax is already too high for the few services received</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The charge would not increase Council revenue, but contribute towards the running costs of the scheme. Any resident who feels that the rateable value of their property has changed is entitled to request a revaluation.</li> </ul>
Excessive parking will be displaced into other areas	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcement of the bays will result in those vehicles currently parked illegally being moved into areas with no parking restrictions at present</li> <li>• Residents will look for unrestricted parking rather than pay the charge causing issues in neighbouring streets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. The situation will be monitored and any appropriate changes will be considered.</li> </ul>
Will cause increase in disputes / animosity between residents	76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If residents have paid for a permit, they will expect a parking space to be guaranteed. Arguments between residents over parking will increase</li> <li>• Residents will be reluctant to move their cars for fear of not being able to park on their return</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the norm for residents parking schemes to operate on a first come, first served basis. It is acknowledged that it is not possible to park two cars within the frontage of most terraced properties. However, not all residents own a vehicle, and not all permit holders will be parked at the same time. Therefore, two permits per property would maximise the use of the available space thereby balancing provision between number of permits issued, demand and available road space. With increased enforcement, residents should have a greater opportunity to find an available space.</li> </ul>
Will a refund be available if unable to find a parking space	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a resident pays for a permit, and is continually unable to find a space, will they be entitled to surrender their permit and receive a refund</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All permits will be valid for a period of 12 months and no refunds will be issued.</li> </ul>
May invalidate motor insurance if the issue of additional permits resulted in the vehicle being parked away from the property	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the responsibility of the vehicle owner to source the appropriate level of insurance cover.</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	NO OF OBJECTORS	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE
Scheme not sanctioned with the full backing of the Council	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County Councillors were unaware of the proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current scheme was originally approved by Cabinet on 31 July 2012, and details of the proposal were supported by Cabinet on 25 July 2018. All affected ward Councillors were consulted by email on 26 July 2018.</li> </ul>
Discrimination as not all streets have residents parking and will therefore not be required to pay	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only properties within the town centre will have to pay the charge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents parking schemes have generally only been introduced where specific problems exist. Any requests to provide new, or to remove existing schemes can be considered following the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement.</li> </ul>
Decrease in property value	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property value will decrease as there will be extra expense for prospective purchasers</li> <li>Limiting to a maximum of two permits per property may put off potential buyers - families with older children would not consider buying a property with such restrictions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It should be noted that it is difficult to determine / predict what effect the proposals will have on property values, however, the highway is provided for the passage of vehicles and there is no definitive right to park on it. Any resident who feels that the rateable value of their property has changed is entitled to request a revaluation.</li> </ul>
Every residential street in the borough should be residents parking with a £1 charge	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjoining streets do not have residents parking and do not have any ill effects such as inconvenience and do not have to pay. If every property in the Borough paid £1 the Council will have achieved its objective of extracting money from residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents parking schemes are only provided to assist residents of a particular area where specific problems exist, but are costly to install, maintain and administer. Therefore, the charges are necessary in order to contribute towards these costs</li> </ul>
Support for business permits	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>