

**ITEM 5**

**INVESTIGATION AND REVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
26TH MAY 2010**

**CABINET – 15TH APRIL 2010**

**Report of the Chief Executive**

**ITEM 7                    RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY - LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY  
ENTRANCES AND PARKING POLICIES**

Purpose of the Report

To permit Cabinet consideration of the report prepared by the Investigation and Review Scrutiny Panel, submitted to Cabinet on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2010, taking into account the need for any further action, having regard to any financial or risk implications

Recommendation

1. That the recommendations of the Investigation and Review Panel, as endorsed by the Investigation and Review Scrutiny Committee are approved with the exception of Recommendations 2(i) and 8(ii).
2. That Recommendation 2(i) is amended to:

That the University and College maintain a register of vehicles owned by students with a view to enabling their own security services to police illegal parking in the streets adjoining the two campuses.

3. That Recommendation 8(ii) is deleted and replaced by:

That the University be urged to engage closely with residents of Coniston Crescent to introduce suitable measures to reduce congestion and disturbance associated with the use of the adjacent pedestrian access to the campus.

Reason

1. To approve the majority of the recommendations within the report.
2. To reflect the need to work in partnership with the University while acknowledging their submission that the extension of the proposed registration scheme to staff would be legally unsustainable and to remove a potential source of confusion in defining, for the purposes of enforcement, inconsiderate parking.
3. To provide an opportunity for further discussion with locally affected parties in attempting to identify a workable solution.

Policy Context

Our Corporate Plan 2009-2012 commits us to becoming a "Better Council." That commitment captures our ambition to improve customer satisfaction and to

improve efficiency by working in partnership. In pursuit of efficient partnership working we look to engage with a wide range of agencies, organisations and businesses, including Loughborough University and Loughborough College.

### Background

In June 2009 residents living within the area immediately adjoining the southern boundary of the Loughborough University campus submitted a petition calling upon the Borough Council to take action to address problems of on-street parking and through traffic associated with the presence of the university. The petitioners adopted the title "Swampedbycars" and claimed also to be acting in the interests of other community groups living in close proximity to the university where parking and traffic problems allegedly were similarly impacting adversely upon residential amenities.

The petition was referred to the Council's Investigation and Review Scrutiny Committee, which referred the matter on to a Panel for close examination. The Panel adopted as its terms of reference the appeals for action identified by *Swampedbycars* and proceeded to receive evidence from interested parties over the period 12th October to 21st December 2009. The Panel report was duly presented to Cabinet on 18th February 2010 and may be viewed by following the link below:

[http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/papers/cab\\_18\\_feb\\_2010\\_item\\_06\\_loughborough\\_university\\_entrances\\_and\\_parking\\_policies\\_panel/Cab%2018%20Feb%202010%20item%2006%20Loughborough%20University%20Entrances%20and%20Parking%20Policies%20Panel.pdf](http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/papers/cab_18_feb_2010_item_06_loughborough_university_entrances_and_parking_policies_panel/Cab%2018%20Feb%202010%20item%2006%20Loughborough%20University%20Entrances%20and%20Parking%20Policies%20Panel.pdf)

Cabinet referred the Panel report to the Chief Executive and Cabinet Lead Member for Planning and called for a report back within two months setting out proposals for further action if necessary, taking into account any financial or risk implications.

The report's recommendations are set out below and accompanied by a commentary, taking into account comments received from participants who contributed to the work of the Scrutiny Panel.

#### **I. Work with the University to agree an outright ban on students having a car within Loughborough, apart from those with special needs.**

##### **Recommendations:**

- i. That an outright ban on students bringing a car to Loughborough cannot be supported.
- ii. That the University and College are urged to pursue all reasonable and legal channels to discourage all campus users from bringing their cars to Loughborough other than in exceptional circumstances.

Loughborough University support I(i) reaffirming their submission that a ban on students bringing cars to Loughborough would be discriminatory and legally unsustainable. The University asserts that it is discouraging all students from



bringing their cars to Loughborough and encouraging other campus users to adopt green commuting options through their Green Travel Plan.

Loughborough College advise that, unlike the University, they are required to operate within a more competitive environment: restrictions of the use of cars among students could place them at a disadvantage in competing for students with neighbouring schools and colleges. The vast majority of students live in postal districts LE11 and LE12. An outright ban would not therefore be practical from the College's perspective as there is no means of distinguishing whether students parking on neighbouring roads are doing so in the capacity of a student or a resident.

Swampedbycars acknowledge that the call for an outright ban on students bringing cars to Loughborough was always a "Big Ask," but believe that the Council has missed an opportunity to establish a long term vision for setting in train the social changes required to meet the UK's green targets and reduce the Carbon Footprint. They further express concern over the Panel's consideration of the Human Rights implications set out in the report, arguing that local residents are also entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes and the roads outside their homes if that is where they park, conferred by [Article 8 (the right to respect for their private and family life, their home etc.) and Article 1 of the First protocol (the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions)]. Implying that the report gives preference to the Human Rights of students over residents it is contended that local authorities are able to limit rights enjoyed under Convention where there is a legitimate aim and the action taken is proportionate.

With respect to Recommendation 1(ii) Swampedbycars support the intent but suggest that it might be strengthened by the inclusion of targets, enforcement actions and a monitoring programme.

## **Response**

The acknowledgement, to varying degrees, by the parties concerned that an outright ban on students bringing their cars to Loughborough cannot be justified is noted. The Panel listened very carefully to submissions to the effect that wider congestion and the collective carbon footprint might be reduced substantially by removing students' vehicles from the network, but was persuaded that it would be unreasonable to restrain one particular group of motorists.

In arriving upon that judgement the Panel had particular regard to the European Convention on Human Rights. The Panel did not dismiss the rights of local residents but were not persuaded that a blanket ban on students bringing their cars to Loughborough could be justified as proportionate in relation to their legitimate rights under the provisions of the Convention.

The Panel also had regard to the broader range of strategic "tools" available to the highway authority to tackle congestion and the adverse impacts of environmentally unsustainable transport choices across all road users. In that exercise it was noted that the County Council, as the relevant highway authority, was about to commence work on the third iteration of the Local Transport Plan (LTP3) and that the Borough Council would be an active partner in the development of that strategy and its

subsequent implementation. A recommendation that the Borough Council commits to that role as part of its normal duties through the Charnwood Highways Forum is made under Recommendation 5(iii).

The importance of the inclusion of targets and monitoring procedures within Green Travel Plans has been identified elsewhere in the Panel's report and recommendations (5(iv) applies). The University has welcomed the thrust of that recommendation set and might be expected therefore to include such targets and monitoring provisions within its revised Green Travel Plan.

**2. Require the University to keep a register of all staff and student vehicles with which to monitor and enforce local parking contraventions.**

**Recommendations**

- i. That the University and College maintain a register of vehicles owned by staff and students with a view to enabling their own security services to police illegal and inconsiderate parking in the streets adjoining the two campuses.
- ii. That registration details are shared with the Borough Council to help identify vehicles that might be breaching a No Car clause attached to a Section 106 Agreement, but parked remotely so as to avoid detection.

Referring to 2(i) above the University reiterates its evidence to the Panel: that it is prepared to explore the possibility of introducing a registration scheme for student cars and that process is underway. However, having taken legal advice the University believes that the extension of registration to staff cars would not be [legally] sustainable. In establishing a registration scheme the University would undertake to respond to incidents of illegal parking only where existing traffic restrictions and its own ordinances apply. (i.e. within the designated Road Traffic Exclusion Order areas). The University agrees with the principle of data sharing (2(ii)) subject to consideration of data protection issues.

Swampedbycars welcome the recommendation set but maintain that the University may introduce into its ordinances whatever reasonable regulations that it requires to control students bringing cars to the town; students could then decide whether to accept the offer of a place in the knowledge of those rules.

**Response**

The preparedness on the part of the University to explore the possibility of introducing a registration scheme for students' vehicles and to police student parking within the area covered by the Road Traffic Exclusion Order would appear to offer a significant step towards the delivery of some compromise. It might also be seen as the limit to what the University considers reasonable within the scope of its ordinances. In excluding staff parking, having taken legal advice on the matter, the offer may not satisfy in full the aspirations of either the Panel or Swampedbycars, but it should be welcomed.

Reference to "inconsiderate" parking within Recommendation 2(i) is potentially confusing and unenforceable; the potency of the recommendation would not be



diminished by its deletion. Furthermore, in light of the legal advice obtained and shared with the Council it would appear that a registration scheme could not be extended to staff and accordingly that requirement too might be deleted from the recommendation as unenforceable.

**3. Require the University to scrap internal rules banning students living within two miles of the University from parking on the campus, causing them to seek parking in surrounding streets.**

**Recommendations.**

- i. That the University be encouraged to retain its policy on students living within two miles and the College similarly be encouraged to retain its policy on staff and students living in LE11.
- ii. That measures to secure the provision of a shuttle bus service across the campus are pursued through the conclusion of the Section 106 Agreement negotiated in connection with the Design Centre proposal.

The University welcomes the Panel's support for its policy of restricting parking (3(i)) as part of a package of green transport measures and advises that the provision of a shuttle bus (3(ii)) is already being implemented. (The provision of that facility is a requirement of the planning agreement attached to the consent for the Design Centre issued on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2010 [Application 09/1445/2 applies]).

Loughborough College intends to retain its policy of banning students resident in the LE11 post core area from parking on campus. The extension of that ban to staff is not considered reasonable as they often are required to transport heavy materials raising health and safety issues.

Swampedbycars have noted Recommendation 3(i) and welcome Recommendation 3(ii)

**Response**

No response is required.

**4. Use Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act to stop staff and students parking in unapproved areas.**

**Recommendations.**

- i. That, when determining applications for developments associated with the University and College, the Borough Council imposes conditions or, failing that, negotiates agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to:
  - secure No Parking clauses within the terms of tenancy agreements so as to prevent cars being brought to Loughborough;
  - secure contributions towards infrastructure designed to enable or facilitate safe or convenient access by public transport, walking or cycling;

and

- secure provision within existing Green Travel Plans to deliver measures to encourage and enable wider use of public transport, walking and cycling as an alternative to dependency on the private car for local trips.

While acknowledging the principle behind the recommendation, the University reaffirms its position given in evidence: that it reserves the right to challenge any conditions, contributions, undertakings or other measures proposed should they be considered disproportionate to the project to which they are applied.

Loughborough College comment that the report has failed to acknowledge the contributions that it has already made to promote alternative sustainable transport. Those measures include the installation and maintenance, entirely at its own expense, of a rising bollard in Radmoor Road to facilitate a dedicated bus corridor, two cycle routes through the grounds (one to satisfy a planning requirement the other voluntarily provided), secure parking and showers for cyclists and a dedicated cycle route between The Gables Halls of residence and the playing fields.

Swampedbycars welcome the recommendation set but suggest that reference within the text of the Panel report to the prospect of the voluntary extension by the University of the “no-parking” agreement applicable to William Morris Hall to other halls on campus should be carried forward into the recommendations.

## **Response**

In the search for brevity in the preparation of the Panel report the commendable efforts of Loughborough College to enhance green travel opportunities were not acknowledged. This report affords the opportunity to remedy that oversight and to formally recognise and welcome the interventions which the College has made at its own expense.

The procedures set out under recommendation 4(i) reflect the current policy approach adopted by the Borough Council. In reserving its right to challenge proposed planning conditions or potential obligations the University is doing no more than protecting its position in planning law; there are specific tests set out in law which must be satisfied before a local planning authority may impose by condition or negotiate by agreement any restraints of the nature outlined in the recommendation.

The voluntary extension of “No Car” agreements to halls other than William Morris where such a regime has been introduced is encouraged under Recommendation 6(ii) where the University has committed to continuously evaluating the situation in the light of experience.



## **5. Increase the scope of the University bus service and other Green Transport solutions.**

### **Recommendations.**

- i. That the efforts of the University and Students Union to encourage wider use of cycling are recognised and that they are directed towards successful schemes working in Nottingham with the involvement of Sustrans, with a view to importing them to Loughborough.
- ii. That the Borough Council uses its position within the Loughborough Quality Bus Partnership to promote discussion among the University, College and bus operators to explore commercially viable options to increasing the frequency and/or the capacity of services linking the railway station and town centre to the campuses. Measures for consideration might also include the provision of free bus passes, improved ticketing and a more attractive pricing structure.
- iii. That the Borough Council through the Charnwood Highways Forum takes advantage of the active partnership with the County Council to promote, encourage and support the preparation of Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3), which can deliver the dualling of Epinal Way along with facilities to enhance and encourage the use of public transport, walking and cycling.
- iv. That all organisations in preparing and monitoring their Green Travel Plans be encouraged, and required where planning controls permit, to incorporate clear targets for traffic reduction, effective monitoring and regular publication of performance.

The University welcomes the thrust of the recommendation set and is already implementing the measures included in recommendation 5(iv) as part of its Green Travel Plan. The support of the Borough Council would be welcomed in engaging with the Quality Bus Partnership (5(ii)) and clarification of what is implied by the dualling of Epinal Way.

Loughborough College advises that it has a mature Green Travel Plan and would support an increase in the number of buses passing through the site and along Epinal Way.

Swampedbycars welcome all four recommendations within the set.

### **Response**

The general support for Green Travel planning initiatives across the board is to be welcomed. With specific reference to a question raised previously as to the ability to measure the success of Green Travel Plans, the University's support for Recommendation 5(iii) is specifically noted and it is expected that they, and others, undertaking these exercises, either voluntarily or in compliance with a planning obligation or condition will have regard to the need to include specific targets and transparent monitoring provisions.

In the interests of clarity there remains a long standing highway reservation along Epinal Way, the purpose of which is to safeguard from development sufficient land to

permit its enhancement to a dual carriageway should traffic conditions necessitate; members of the Panel considered that additional carriageway width might permit the provision of dedicated bus lanes to encourage wider use of public transport.

**6. When possible, place a car ownership limit on each [student] rented property within Loughborough.**

**Recommendations.**

- i. There are no legal powers available to the Borough Council to impose any limit on parking associated with private tenancies other than those where a Section 106 agreement is in force.
- ii. The University is urged to extend its parking controls as introduced with William Morris Hall to other halls of residence on and off campus, subject to the normal exemptions.

Storer and Ashby Residents Group (SARG) maintain that there are precedents which would justify limiting the number of parking permits to one as opposed to two vehicles per household within residents' preference parking schemes where a non-council tax paying household is concerned. They cite as an example the regime at Salcombe Harbour where mooring permits are allocated to South Hams Council Tax payers only.

Loughborough University made no comment in respect of 6(i) but advise that significant restrictions are already applied to students living in halls on and off campus in response to recommendation 6(ii). The University commit to continuously evaluating the possibility of extending additional parking controls to other residences over time in the light of experience. The impact of the further recommendations being implemented as outcomes of the Scrutiny Panel will now also need to be considered.

In response to Recommendation 6(i) Swampedbycars suggest that measures to restrict parking associated with private tenancies might be pursued through the promotion of the "Good Landlord Accreditation Scheme" promoted by the Borough Council. The second element of the recommendation is welcomed.

**Response**

Residents' Preference Parking schemes are managed by the County highway authority and any amendments to the regulations governing the issue of permits to Non-Council tax paying households reasonably might be made directly to that authority within the framework of the current West Loughborough Parking Study. The Panel was unaware of the South Hams case and therefore unable to take it into account in framing its recommendations.

The landlord accreditation scheme is primarily concerned with matters relating to the health and safety of residents and adherence to the management standards; as such it would not appear to lend itself to use as a vehicle for the imposition of parking controls falling outside the curtilage of the property concerned.



**7. Review the University entrances with a view to securing the permanent closure of those at Ashleigh Drive and Spinney Hill Drive.**

**Recommendations.**

- i. That no action be taken to close the vehicular access at Ashleigh Drive and Spinney Hill Drive because they provide a valuable access and their loss would have disadvantageous spin off effects in the wider transport network.

The recommendation is supported by the University and noted by Swampedbycars.

**Response**

No response required.

**8. Review pedestrian safety around pedestrian access points and their hours of opening.**

**Recommendations.**

- i. We urge the University to investigate the causes of the noise nuisance [in the vicinity of Coniston Crescent] and introduce measures to mitigate them.
- ii. We urge the University to close the overnight (between 10.30pm and 6.00am) access via Coniston Crescent, with the possibility of some relaxation during exam periods.

In response to 8(i) the University advises that it has systems in place to monitor the causes of noise nuisance at Coniston Crescent. It has reservations over the closure of the Coniston Crescent access for reasons of welfare believing that such action would simply shift legitimate pedestrian access to other entrances potentially occasioning disturbance to neighbours in those locations.

Recommendation 8(i) is welcomed by Swampedbycars, but in respect of Recommendation 8(ii) the Council is urged to seek the restriction of the library opening hours to 10:30 pm and to keep the gate open. It is argued that this is already an extension to the established closure time of 9:00 pm while the closure of the route, as recommended, would place an undue pressure on the last remaining pedestrian access on the south side of the university.

**Response**

There is some consensus that the Panel's recommendation that the Coniston Crescent access be closed at certain times would be undesirable. The Panel was particularly anxious to find a solution to problems of parking congestion and late night noise and disturbance associated with the use of the access off Coniston Crescent. There is no opportunity to discuss with the University the alternative suggestion that the library opening hours be reduced, while the monitoring measures installed by the University might yet reveal a more effective response. Given the remaining uncertainties it may be preferable to substitute in place of Recommendation 8(ii) that the University be urged to engage closely with residents

of Coniston Crescent to introduce suitable measures to reduce congestion and disturbance associated with the use of the adjacent pedestrian access to the campus.

During the course of its enquiries the Panel heard that the University had commissioned its own audit of the safety of access points around the University. There was no reference to any particular problems arising in connection with the pedestrian access to Falkner/Eggington Court off Forest Road, nor were any matters raised by either the County Council or the various residents groups who appeared to give evidence. However, the access point does fall within the remit of the West Loughborough Parking Study and if identified as a particular problem point may attract proposals for the introduction of specific control measures.

**9. Require the University to provide more pay and display parking on campus.**

**Recommendation.**

- i. That the University give consideration to the merits of designating some existing spaces for pay and display parking for non permit holders as a means of enabling short term or evening parking on campus so as to alleviate unauthorised parking on neighbouring streets, particularly for library users, as part of its overall car parking strategy for the campus.

The University advise that a review of the campus wide parking strategy is planned. The recommendation is welcomed by Swampedbycars.

**Response**

No response is required.

**10. Investigate the effects of building on campus land which was previously car parks.**

**Recommendation**

- i. Introduce the shuttle bus in accordance with the Section 106 Agreement; ensure its route is appropriate.

The University advise that measures are in hand to introduce a shuttle bus service. (See commentary under recommendation 3 above)

While welcoming the recommendation Swampedbycars contend that the minimalist consideration by the Panel of this issue undermines the otherwise very thorough approach adopted. It is noted that this particular area for investigation was specifically added to the Panel's remit by the Cabinet Lead Member for Planning. In summary the community group argue that successive developments on the campus have taken out of service areas of car parking and that the University has failed to provide replacement facilities in accordance with planning requirements and Supplementary Planning Document commitments. The following evidence is cited in support of those claims:



- Extensions to David Collett Hall resulted in the loss of parking in the early 1990's which has not been replaced, contrary to a planning requirement.
- The building of the Engineering blocks on the West Site in the mid 1990's similarly absorbed parking areas which have not been replaced; coupled with the rapid increase in staff that development created the need for a new multi-storey car park.
- The development of the new student accommodation has resulted in the loss of several hundred parking spaces.
- The new multi-storey car park cannot compensate for all lost spaces and service new build departments a mile away on the East Site; the Supplementary Planning Document for the East Site was supposed to include a multi-storey car park but attracted no mention in the application for the new Design Centre.
- In consequence of these losses parking problems have been shifted off the campus into the surrounding communities.

## Response

Prior to the issue of Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport, in March 2001 it was standard practice in controlling development to require maximum levels of on site parking provision to reduce the incidence of parking spilling over into adjacent areas occasioning congestion. PPG 13 marked a profound shift in transport planning; one characterised by seeking to reduce volumes and the trend towards dependency upon the private car as the primary means of transport.

Amongst other initiatives PPG 13 required that parking standards should be applied as maxima rather than minima and recognised parking restraint as a key lever in discouraging the use of the private car. As an alternative to the private car developers were to be encouraged to contribute towards or facilitate through Green Travel Plans the wider use of more sustainable transport choices such as public transport, walking and cycling. The guidance recognised the potential for a perverse outcome with motorists electing to park in alternative locations conveniently positioned in relation to their final destination but pointed to the scope for on street traffic controls to regulate such behaviour. These issues were central to the Panel's consideration of the matter.

It follows that the conditions originally imposed upon the University to compensate for the loss of car parking, whether or not they were discharged, is now largely academic. The general thrust of parking policy over the past decade has been to rein in parking provision and in that context any measures to reduce levels of parking associated with historical maximum parking standards reasonably might be perceived as a desirable outcome of policy.

The essential question is whether there are sufficient spaces available on campus to satisfy the current minimum standards for parking on further and higher education institutions as recommended in Appendix D to PPG 13; i.e. 1 space per 2 members of staff and 1 space per 15 students. The Panel was content to accept the University's assertion that it could meet that standard. The University has since submitted a detailed audit of parking demonstrating the availability of some 3,383

spaces. Allowing for 16,834 students creating a need for 1,122 spaces and 3,158 staff creating a need for 1,579 spaces there would appear to be a PPG13 compliant need for 2,701 spaces, suggesting a surplus of 682.

The University and the Panel jointly recognised that the available spaces were not necessarily equitably or conveniently distributed across the campus hence the recommendation that a shuttle bus service be introduced to deliver a local "park and ride" service.

The need for additional parking as subsequent phases of development on the University roll out will be kept under review. The opportunity within the adopted East Park Supplementary Planning Document for a multi-storey car park was advanced within a framework for the comprehensive redevelopment of that sector of the University and may remain a constituent part of any such wider redevelopment scheme, while having regard to the overall need for car parking across the campus

**11. Investigate the viability of Charnwood Borough Council exerting influence to help alleviate parking problems in the vicinity of the University campus.**

**Recommendations**

- i. The existing channels for communication are maintained.
- ii. That Loughborough Campus and Community Liaison Group is invited to include as a standing item the monitoring of the recommendations endorsed by Cabinet coming from the work of the Panel.

Both recommendations are agreeable to the University.

Loughborough College note that unlike neighbouring towns and cities there are no public car parks in the vicinity of the combined campuses so if motorists choose not to use public transport and cannot access on-campus parking they have no alternative other than to park on street. The College would welcome investigation into the provision of a public car park either close to the College or adjacent to a park and ride service.

Swampedbycars note Recommendation 11(i) and advise that they will take up representation on the Liaison Group (11(ii)). However, they express concern that there is no provision for the escalation of unresolved issues within the constitution of the Liaison Group and that is perceived as an anomaly.

**Response**

No response is required.



**12. Investigate the viability of the Panel submitting information to the County Council Highways Forum for Charnwood's West Loughborough Parking Study.**

**Recommendations.**

- i. The Panel's report will go to the next meeting of the County Council Highways Forum for Charnwood on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010.
- ii. The County Council should continue to investigate and consult on options, looking at the problem in the round. They should find suitable schemes that are proportionate to the problems experienced in any particular area, and at the same time do not displace unauthorised parking onto neighbouring areas.
- iii. The highway authority is advised of the parking controls imposed at Arnos Grove (London) as an alternative to the potentially inconvenient all day controls proposed in the recent consultation.
- iv. Residents groups who gave evidence to the Panel are advised that, notwithstanding the use of university ordinances and rules, it is apparent from the lines of enquiry pursued with other university towns that the primary means for enforcement is delivered through traffic regulation orders imposed and policed by, or on behalf of, the local highway authority.
- v. In particular, we advise the petitioners that a variable pattern of traffic regulation orders imposing controls in some areas only, where they appear to be supported by local residents, could result in the displacement of the problem, exacerbating parking congestion in those streets falling outside the control areas. The problem must be considered in the round.
- vi. That is the event of traffic regulation orders being approved to manage on street parking, the University and College are invited to contribute towards the costs of establishing the schemes and/or their ongoing enforcement so as to reduce the costs on the public purse and/or residents.

The University reiterates the advice offered to the Panel: that it supports the County Council's West Loughborough Parking study and the implementation of a managed parking strategy. The University reaffirms its offer to contribute to the first year costs of residents in schemes recommended by the study, subject to discussions with the County Council.

Swampedbycars reiterate their contention that a solution reliant upon Traffic Regulation Orders will simply transfer the problem of street parking on to the next residential area leading to a further wave of dissatisfied residents/voters; the correct solution must be to reduce the volume of cars coming to the town.

**Response**

The comments and recommendations of the Panel already have been brought to the attention of the highway authority through the Charnwood Highways Forum meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 and may be factored into the further rounds of consultation connected with the progression of the West Loughborough Parking Study as it progresses towards the formal consideration of potential Traffic Regulation Orders in partnership with the communities most directly concerned.

### Financial Implications

The recommendations have no direct financial implications accruing to the Borough Council.

### Risk Management

<b>Risk Identified</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Risk Management Actions Planned</b>
That recommendations cannot be carried into effect for legal reasons.	Low	Low	Adjustments have been recommended to avoid potential legal conflict

Key Decision: No

Background Papers: None

Officer to Contact: David Hankin - Director of Development  
01509 634761  
dave.hankin@charnwood.gov.uk