

6. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1. Common Charging Policy

- 6.1.1. The tariff structures identified in section 2.9 demonstrate a degree of difference between CBC operated car parks and privately operated car parks although it is appreciated that this may not be realistically achievable. All CBC public car parks currently operate using a common tariff structure with the exception of Browns Lane where the tariff structure is set in a manner to deter non-leisure centre users from using the car park despite it being designated as a town centre car park. All privately operated public car parks operate using different tariff structures to CBC car parks. **In order to provide consistency throughout the town centre and to reduce any tendency for vehicles to travel through town in order to park where parking is cheapest, it is recommended that the same tariff structure is applied at all CBC and privately operated town centre public car parks.**
- 6.1.2. With the exception of a 4 hour ticket, Carillon Court is cheaper than CBC car parks (tariff structures shown in section 2.9). **It is recommended that discussions are held between CBC and management at Carillon Court regarding the possibility of amending the tariff structure at Carillon Court so it is the same as CBC car parks.** It could be that CBCs tariff structure could be more profitable for Carillon Court than the tariff structure currently applied.
- 6.1.3. The tariff structure at Regent Place is structured in a manner to attract customers. Whilst it is considered unlikely that the operators of these car parks will apply the same tariff to customers as non-customers, **there is scope for CBC to approach Regent Place with the recommendation that the tariff for non-customers is the same as at CBC operated car parks.**
- 6.1.4. The tariff structure during weekday daytime periods at The Rushes car park is the same as at CBC public car parks. However, in order to attract customers, people spending £5.00 in Woolworths, Marks and Spencer, or LA Fitness are entitled to 2 hours free parking. It is considered unlikely that management at The Rushes would consider removing this free parking as it is likely to be a significant factor when people choose to use The Rushes. Furthermore, the provision of 2 hours free parking was likely to form part of the tenancy agreement between The Rushes and the stores. Applying 2 hours free parking in other town centre car parks so they are consistent with The Rushes car park is wholly inappropriate primarily because it would conflict with national, regional, and local sustainable transport policies. Encouraging people to choose alternative modes of travel is difficult whilst free parking exists. Furthermore, the practicalities of implementing such a

scheme are likely to be very difficult. Unlike CBC operated car parks The Rushes car park does not offer a reduced tariff during evening periods or on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

- 6.1.5. It is considered inappropriate that Somerfield car park is free of charge to all users. Despite the poor condition of the car park (discussed further in paragraphs 6.17.8 to 6.17.10) people choose to park here almost certainly because it is free and close to the town centre. This contradicts with national planning policy guidance for encouraging people to use alternative modes of travel. Whilst free parking exists it is difficult to encourage people to use alternatives to the private car.
- 6.1.6. It is also considered inappropriate that Sainsbury's car park is free of charge for all users. This car park is well maintained and conveniently located for access to most of the town centre. It is anticipated that town centre users will try to park here because parking is free. The provision of free parking contradicts with national policy guidance for encouraging people to use alternative modes of travel as outlined in paragraph 6.1.5. **It is recommended that discussions are held between CBC and Sainsbury's with a view to re-introducing parking charges at Sainsbury's car park.**

Daytime to Evening Overlap

- 6.1.7. Through the consultation process it became apparent that some car park users find the existing tariff structure in CBC operated car parks confusing if they are parking for a period of time that overlaps between daytime and evening weekday charges. The correct payment would be the daily rate for the length of time required up until 18:00 and then an additional 50p to cover the length of stay in the evening. This is considered a reasonable system. However, there is no information in any CBC car parks explaining how this process operates. **It is recommended that information is provided in the vicinity of the payment machines clearly explaining the process involved.** The display on the existing ticket machines indicates the length of stay purchased as coins are inserted into the machine yet users are not instructed as to how this system works beforehand.

6.2. Tariff Structure

- 6.2.1. It is evident from section 2.21 that the sale of car parking tickets forms an important element of CBC's total revenue budget. However, it is important to note that the IHT document 'Parking Strategies and Management' states that the practice of raising general income through parking tariff setting is not generally supported in Government guidance. The document goes on to state that the price of parking should support the policy not constitute the policy.

- 6.2.2. It is important when deciding upon the most appropriate tariff structure that the time bands are appropriate to what car park users typically do. The IHT document 'Parking Strategies and Management' provides an example of a tariff structure appropriate for a provincial town with a sub-regional catchment area. The example given is similar to the existing structure operated in CBC car parks in Loughborough. The incremental increases in tariff are set in a manner to favour vehicles parking for a short stay in a car park. Analysis of ticket sale information throughout Loughborough indicates that the majority of trips are for 2 or less hours in length and would suggest that the existing tariff structure is appropriate to the needs of car park users. Given the size and nature of Loughborough and in accordance with national, regional, and local policies, long stay commuters should be discouraged from parking in public car parks and should instead seek to use alternative modes of travel. Under the existing tariff structure the maximum charge is £5.70. This could be considered quite low given that vehicles can park for a full day at this price. However, only 2% of vehicles parking in CBC car parks during the period 2005 / 2006 did so for more than 6 hours. This suggests that the existing tariff structure is such that it deters long stay commuters. It also suggests that there is a large amount of PNR spaces in the town centre which cater for long stay commuter parking. Furthermore, consideration of the national and regional comparisons undertaken in sections 3.4 to 3.7 indicates that the existing £5.70 daily charge is appropriate to Loughborough.
- 6.2.3. During the stakeholder consultations undertaken by WYG the issue was raised as to whether retailers could pay a fee each year to allow free off-street town centre parking for shoppers. The provision of free parking is considered to conflict with national, regional, and local sustainable transport policies. Encouraging people to choose alternative modes of travel is difficult whilst free parking exists. Furthermore, it is considered unlikely that all retailers would support such a scheme. **Therefore, it is recommended that the provision of free off-street public parking is not progressed further.**
- 6.2.4. Consideration has been given to introducing Sunday and Bank Holiday charges in CBC car parks. It appears inconsistent to have parking charges at all other times of the week except Sunday. A standard charge of 50p could be applied at all CBC and privately operated public car parks as with weekday evening parking.
- 6.2.5. Parking data at CBC car parks is unavailable for Sundays and Bank Holidays because tickets are not purchased. Assuming the number of tickets sold is just half of the number sold on a typical weekday of a typical month (Wednesday in November) approximately £350 would be generated per day (£20,600 per year). Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I. It is recommended that a standard 50p parking charge is introduced on Sundays.** It is not considered appropriate at this stage to introduce daytime weekday and Saturday parking charges on Sundays or Bank Holidays. This is likely to be poorly received

by town centre users and stakeholders. Furthermore, public transport provision on Sundays and Bank Holidays isn't as frequent as at other times so the opportunity to travel via a mode other than the private car is more limited and it is therefore considered inappropriate to have higher charges whilst the availability of alternatives is more limited.

6.2.6. Revenue from ticket sales for the period 2005 / 2006 was £707,000. Based on the existing tariff structure and assuming ticket sales are the same for the 2006 / 2007 period as they were for the 2005 / 2006 period it is estimated that income for the period 2006 / 2007 will be approximately £741,000. 46% of ticket sales for the 2005 / 2006 period were for 2 hour tickets. The existing cost of a 2 hour ticket is £1.40. It is considered that a small increase in the 2 hour parking charge will have minimal impact on parking demand whilst reducing the cost of the 3 hour parking charge will 'balance out' the overall tariff structure. By increasing the cost of a 2 hour ticket to £1.50 it is estimated that approximately £25,000 could be generated from this ticket type in additional revenue for the period 2006 / 2007. By reducing the cost of the 3 hour ticket from £2.20 to £2.10 it is estimated that revenue will decrease by approximately £4000 for the period 2006 / 2007. This change will therefore result in an estimated increase in revenue for the period 2006 / 2007 of £21,000. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I. Recommendation:- the 2 and 3 hour parking charges are amended as outlined above.**

6.2.7. **It is recommended that a tariff review is undertaken once a year.**

Evening Charges for Leisure Centre and Bowls Club users

6.2.8. At present parking charges do not apply for leisure centre or bowls club users at Browns Lane Car Park beyond 18:00 yet they do earlier in the day. It is considered unfair that those who use the leisure centre or bowls club in the evening do not have to pay for parking whereas those who use them during the day do, particularly as the leisure centre is busiest during evening periods. **It is recommended that evening charges are extended to include this car park as well. Town centre users should have to pay a charge of 50p (as per other town centre car parks). Leisure centre and bowls club users should pay a concessionary charge of 30p.** During the WYG evening survey undertaken at this car park 377 vehicles parked between 18:00 and 21:00. It is assumed that each of these vehicles are associated with the leisure centre or bowls club. Charging each of these vehicles 30p would have generated £113.10 in ticket sale revenue during this period.

6.2.9. CBC has confirmed that Thursday is the busiest evening of the week although they also confirmed that other weekday evenings are also busy. In order to estimate the potential income that could be generated by applying evening charges for the leisure centre and bowls club it has been assumed that other weekday evenings and Sunday evenings have

10% less vehicles parking than on a Thursday. For a Saturday evening it has been assumed that the number of vehicles parking is 50% the number of those parking on a Thursday evening. Using these assumptions it is estimated that approximately £35,000 per year could be generated by charging leisure centre and bowls club users an evening charge of 30p. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I**.

Disabled Parking Charges

6.2.10. Consideration has been given to introducing disabled parking charges at all existing parking spaces. CBC have indicated that some disabled users currently stay longer than the existing time restrictions. Following the introduction of CPE any issue regarding on-street parking restrictions is likely to reduce significantly. Whilst there may still be a problem in car parks it is not considered appropriate to introduce the same charges for disabled users that are applied to standard spaces for the following reasons:-

- Introduction of parking charges is likely to mean blue badge holders could park in undesignated parking areas which they are legally entitled to do. The practicalities and financial cost of enforcing charges in these areas is not considered cost effective.
- Only a few of the destinations compared with Loughborough in sections 3.4 and 3.5 enforce disabled parking charges. These charges are minimal or apply to long term parking only.
- It is considered that introducing disabled parking charges in Loughborough would be seen as discriminating against a user group who would struggle without use of their cars.

6.2.11. **Recommendation:- It is not considered appropriate to introduce disabled parking charges at the present time.** However, it should be noted that the introduction of a pay on foot method of payment would result in disabled users having to pay the same tariff as standard users. A pay on foot method of payment requires all users to take a ticket when they enter the car park. The system cannot distinguish between standard users and disabled users.

6.2.12. **It is recommended that usage of disabled parking spaces is monitored and reviewed in 1 year to ascertain whether or not usage of these spaces is being abused.** The introduction of disabled charges in off-street car parks for parking greater than 3 hours in length should be considered following the review.

6.3. New Public Car Parking

Southfield Road Offices Car Park

6.3.1. During the week Southfield Offices Car Park operates free of charge to CBC employees and visitors only. This Parking Strategy recommends that 30 spaces remain for CBC employees and visitors with the remaining number of spaces designated as town centre parking spaces. **It is recommended that the same tariff structure is introduced at this car park for all car park users as is currently operating in all other CBC car parks (excluding town centre users in Browns Lane Car Park).**

6.3.2. During the week there will be an additional 76 town centre parking spaces subject to parking charges available at Southfield Offices car park. On Saturdays there will be 16 less town centre parking spaces subject to parking charges at this car park. Because town centre users do not currently park at Southfield Offices car park assumptions have to be made regarding vehicle behaviour in order to estimate future revenue. Based on the average income per CBC car park parking space and average weekly occupancy of CBC car parks during the period 2005 / 2006 it is estimated that the recommended changes at Southfield Offices car park will generate approximately £16,500 per year. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I**.

Browns Lane Car Park Improvements

6.3.3. The TCMP identifies the possibility of providing additional car parking adjacent to Browns Lane. Under the existing tariff structure the existing Browns Lane Car Park is not considered to be a town centre car park by many (as supported by the low number of pay and display tickets sold) and the provision of a new town centre car park at the same location could be considered inappropriate. However, a car park in this location with improved links into the town centre would provide a better locational balance of parking in the town centre (in particular for people approaching the town centre from a south-west direction) given the reduction in on-street parking in the area. Furthermore, in the past the existing Browns Lane car park was well used by town centre users before the existing tariff structure was introduced. The provision of this car park could form part of the wider picture to redevelopment land in the vicinity of Devonshire Square. **With this in mind it is recommended that a new car park at Browns Lane is a suitable location for a town centre car park.** Consideration has been given to the feasibility of the following options:-

- providing a decked car park at the extension to the existing Browns Lane car park or
- providing a new surface level car park on land in the vicinity of the leisure centre adjacent to Browns Lane.

Option 1:- Decked Car Park

- 6.3.4. The size and layout of the existing car park does not lend itself particularly well towards providing a decked car park. However, consideration has been given to decking the extension car park. It is estimated that provision of internal ramps would result in a loss of approximately 15 existing spaces. It is estimated that approximately 50 spaces could be provided on a new level resulting in a net gain of 35 spaces. The estimated cost of undertaking these works is estimated to be in the region of £250,000 – 300,000. **The costs are considered to outweigh the benefits in this instance and as such it is recommended that this option is not progressed.**

Option 2:- Surface Level Car Park

- 6.3.5. Consideration has been given to the feasibility of providing a surface level pay and display car park in front of the leisure centre. Preliminary work indicates that approximately 70 spaces could be provided with access being taken adjacent to the existing access to the leisure centre as shown on **Figure 6. It is recommended that a new car park is provided along Browns Lane.**
- 6.3.6. In terms of the location of a new Browns Lane car park in relation to the town centre analysis reveals that if a 1.8m/s walking speed is assumed Market Street and Market Place are within a 5 minute walking distance of a new Browns Lane car park. Peripheral town centre streets can be accessed if a 1.2m/s walking speed is assumed. The town centre is well within a 10 minute walking distance of a new Browns Lane car park when a 1.2m/s or 1.8m/s walking speed is assumed.
- 6.3.7. Access to the new Browns Lane Car Park is proposed via a new priority junction with the access road to the existing car park as shown on **Figure 6**. The existing level of the land adjacent to Browns Lane is variable. At some locations it's approximately 2.5m below the Browns Lane carriageway. To address the level differences land could either be infilled or cut away to create a level surface for construction of the car park. An approximate estimate of £100,000 for both options is considered reasonable at this preliminary stage. Uncertainties regarding drainage could increase the cost of the 'cut-away' option.
- 6.3.8. In order to improve the attractiveness of the new car park the method for crossing Browns Lane needs improving. There is an existing subway towards the western end of Browns Lane but no controlled crossing points across Browns Lane itself. Modelling work undertaken by LCC does not indicate a large increase in flows along Browns Lane as a result of the TCMP proposals. On this basis it is not considered appropriate that a

controlled crossing point is located along Browns Lane. **It is recommended that improvements are made along Browns Lane and to the existing subway to improve its attractiveness. As part of the proposals to improve Queens Park, improved links should be made with the subway and pedestrian refuge.**

- 6.3.9. Two cycle routes operate in the vicinity of Browns Lane Car Park with cyclists passing through the car park. The provision of a new car park in front of the leisure centre adjacent to Browns Lane will have implications for these cycle routes. **Recommendation:- during the detailed design stage for the new car park, specific consideration should be given to the requirements of cyclists to ensure that their requirements do not conflict with those of cars.** Consideration should be given to providing a route for cyclists adjacent to the new car park with access to Queens Park via the existing subway.
- 6.3.10. The evening survey undertaken by WYG at Browns Lane Car Park (see paragraph 2.16.6) indicated that the car park was above 85% occupied for 2 of the 3 hours surveyed. It is anticipated that the new town centre car park adjacent to Browns Lane would have spare capacity in the evenings (outside of peak times) and as such could act as an overflow car park for the leisure centre and bowls club at these times if required.
- 6.3.11. During the week there will be an additional 70 town centre parking spaces subject to parking charges available at a new Browns Lane car park. Because only a very small number of town centre users currently park at the existing Browns Lane car park because the tariff structure is set in a manner to deter them assumptions have to be made regarding vehicle behaviour in order to estimate future revenue. Based on the average income per CBC car park parking space and average weekly occupancy of CBC car parks during the period 2005 / 2006 it is estimated that the recommended new Browns Lane car park will generate approximately £19,000 per year. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I**.

Proposed IRR Car Park

- 6.3.12. **It is recommended that the car park is operated by CBC.** This will enable CBC to operate the same tariff structure in this car park as in other car parks. If the car park is owned by a private operator all maintenance and other ownership obligations will be undertaken by the private operator. CBC would however need an agreement in place whereby the surface level car park can be developed in the future as a multi-storey car park. If the car park is to be owned by CBC, they will be responsible for all ownership obligations.

- 6.3.13. In terms of the location of a new IRR car park in relation to the town centre analysis reveals that the town centre is well within a 5 minute walk of a new IRR car park when a 1.8m/s or 1.2m/s walking speed is assumed.

Summary

- 6.3.14. Based on the proposals outlined in the TCMP and the recommendations being made by WYG the overall number of car park parking spaces available during the week will increase by 95, and on Saturday will increase by 83. It is estimated that the annual increase in revenue will be approximately £24,800 (including changes recommended at Southfield Road Offices and Browns Lane car parks as outlined in section this section). Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I**.

6.4. Financial Impact – Tariff Structure Changes and New Car Parks

- 6.4.1. It is estimated that the recommendations presented in sections 6.2 and 6.3 will have the following impact on income generation as summarised in **Table 27** below:-

Table 27:- Estimated Financial Impact of Tariff Structure Changes and New Car Parks

Initiative	Estimated annual increase (based on WYG 2006 / 2007 revenue projections)
Changes to 2 hour & 3 hour tariff structure	£21,000
Introduction of 50p Sunday and Bank Holiday charge	£20,600
Evening charge for leisure centre users	£35,000
Changes to the number of parking spaces in car parks throughout the town centre (see note)	£24,800
Total	£101,400

Note:- This includes new Browns Lane car park, public use of Southfield Offices car park, and closure of Pinfold Gate and Macaulay House car parks.

6.5. Payment Methodology

Browns Lane Leisure Centre and Bowls Club Car Park

- 6.5.1. Browns Lane Car Park is designated as a town centre car park with users of the leisure centre and bowls club sharing it with visitors to the town centre. The tariff for leisure centre and bowls club users is less than the tariff for town centre users and as such few leisure centre and bowls club users use the standard pay and display ticket machines. The method

of payment for leisure centre and bowls club users is a particular issue that has been highlighted during consultation carried out for this study. The existing system requires leisure centre users to park their car then collect a ticket from the leisure centre or bowls club reception and return to their car to display the ticket. This is particularly frustrating for people with young children. The frustration is increased when there is a queue at the reception or during adverse weather conditions.

6.5.2. Car park survey information indicates that the majority of vehicles parked in the car park are associated with the leisure centre. It is also quite likely that a proportion of the vehicles using the pay and display ticket machines are actually leisure centre customers who decided to pay the tariff for town centre users rather than obtain a ticket from inside the leisure centre. **Recommendation:- the existing car park is designated as a leisure centre and bowls club car park.**

6.5.3. In designating the car park as a leisure centre and bowls club car park it is considered an appropriate time to review the method of payment at this car park. A number of options have been considered, as outlined in the following paragraphs:-

Option 1

6.5.4. Barriers are installed at the car park access / egress. The layout of the car park is such that there is only space for 1 entry and 1 exit barrier. The entry barrier could be activated by a vehicle detector. A barrier operated in this manner reduces the likelihood of queues occurring as drivers are not required to take a ticket from a machine to activate the barrier. Nevertheless, two possible options for the method of operation of the egress barrier have been considered:-

- Users of the leisure centre and bowls club pay for car parking when they use either facility. They are then given a number to input into a keypad to activate a barrier located at the car park egress. However, problems can arise with this method when drivers reach the barrier and forget the number. This could cause significant queuing internally within the car park particularly as there is only space for 1 exit barrier. It was noted during the WYG evening survey that a large number of vehicles 'drop off' and 'pick up' visitors to the leisure centre and bowls club without using the facility themselves. These vehicles would not be charged for parking, yet difficulties would arise in distinguishing between vehicles parking and those 'dropping off'. For these reasons this system is considered unfeasible.

- Users of the leisure centre and bowls club pay for car parking when they use either facility. They could then be given a token in the leisure centre or bowls club to insert into a machine near the egress barrier in order to activate it. As with the 'keypad' method of operation the practicalities of this system are thrown in to doubt by vehicles 'dropping off' and 'picking up'.

Option 2

6.5.5. Introduction of a pay on foot method of payment. A ticket machine could be located inside the leisure centre and bowls club allowing only leisure centre and bowls club users to park in the car park. A period of 10 or 15 minutes free parking could be allowed in order to account for vehicles 'dropping off' or 'picking up'. Drivers of these vehicles would be required to validate their ticket at a machine before leaving the car park. The nature of trips to and from the leisure centre are such that there is a concentration of vehicles entering and leaving the car park on each hour. The existing car park layout experiences congestion at these times. Installation of a single barrier (there is insufficient space for 2 exit barriers) would significantly increase queuing at these times as traffic is required to wait at the barrier. There is insufficient queuing space within the car park to accommodate the likely queue lengths. The introduction of a pay on foot system would make it difficult to enforce the 'no return within one hour' restriction. The system itself cannot identify the behaviour of individual vehicles.

6.5.6. **For the reasons outlined in paragraph 6.5.5 a barrier system is not recommended at Browns Lane Car Park.**

Option 3

6.5.7. Whilst the methods outlined so far are intended to 'restrict' non-leisure centre and non-bowls club users from using the car park it is not considered essential that this is the case. The majority of vehicles parking in the car park at present are associated with the leisure centre and bowls club. The peak hour at this car park is different from the peak hour in other car parks. Only a small number of non-leisure centre and non-bowls club users currently park in the car park and the majority of these do so during periods of the day when Browns Lane Car Park has spare capacity. A method of payment that would not restrict vehicles from parking in the car park is a two part ticket option. Users would purchase a ticket from a pay and display machine for the higher tariff band as shown in **Table 3**. Those not using the leisure centre or bowls club would display both parts of the ticket on their vehicle. Users of the leisure centre and bowls club would display half the ticket in their vehicle and claim a refund from inside the leisure centre or bowls club for the difference between the higher and lower tariffs as shown in **Table 3**. This allows vehicles

to drop off / pick up leisure centre or bowls club users without having to pay for parking. This is the cheapest option presented, only involving a change to the software in each pay and display machine.

- 6.5.8. The estimated financial implications of each option are presented in **Appendix I** and are summarised in **Table 28** as follows:-

Table 28:- Estimated Financial Cost of Improving Browns Lane Car Park

Expense	'Keypad' option	'Token' option	Pay on Foot option	'Two Part Ticket' option
Total for ticket machines and barriers	£18,000	£18,000	£58,000	£350
Redesign of entry / exits and new signage	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£0
Loss of income due to a reduction in spaces	£0	£0	£0	£0
Loss of income due to changes in operational practices	£6,300 (see paragraph 6.5.9)	£6,300 (see paragraph 6.5.9)	£6,300 (see paragraph 6.5.9)	£0

- 6.5.9. Approximately £6,300 of revenue was generated from fines during the period 2005 / 2006 at Browns Lane car park. The majority of income from fines is generated from vehicles without a ticket and vehicles with an expired ticket. With a keypad, token, and pay on foot option income from these sources will be lost. Although some fine income will not be lost, as a worst case assessment it has been assumed that all fine income will be lost. It is important to note that it is likely that the introduction of a pay on foot system at Browns lane would generate some additional income from additional ticket sales whereby people park for longer than they previously did under the pay and display method of payment.
- 6.5.10. **It is recommended that discussions are held between CBC and management at the leisure centre and bowls club with the recommendation that a two-part ticket system is introduced at the Browns Lane car park.**

Pay and Display / Pay on Foot

- 6.5.11. The Rushes car park currently operates with a pay on foot method of payment. All other car parks operate a pay and display method of payment. None of the existing car parks operate a pay on exit method of payment. The Town Centre User Satisfaction Questionnaire referred to in item 3.2.5 indicated that 44.1% of respondents would support a change to pay

on exit and 39.4% would prefer to stay with the current system. Of the 44.1% in support of a change 39.1% of these would still support change if it resulted in an increase in parking charges. The majority of Stakeholders, and representatives of the Chamber of Trade and Commerce consulted during preparation of this Parking Strategy prefer pay on exit / pay on foot.

6.5.12. Pay on exit and pay on foot systems require barriers to be installed at the access and egress points to the car park. Drivers obtain a ticket when they enter the car park. With pay on exit drivers have in the past paid an attendant situated near the exit barrier, however this is becoming less and less common. It is favourable to have a pay on exit machine. Pay on exit is only effective if there are adequate exit lanes. Drivers searching for change, or seeking assistance when they don't have the appropriate change can cause internal queuing within the car park. Pay on foot differs from pay on exit in that users pay for their parking at a machine located away from the exit barrier immediately before they leave the car park. The machine then issues a validated ticket which is inserted into another machine at the barrier location. This reduces the amount of time taken for a vehicle to pass through the barrier and therefore increases the capacity of a barrier. **Pay on foot is considered preferable to pay on exit.**

6.5.13. **Table 29** summarises the advantages and disadvantages of a pay and display method of payment:-

Table 29:- Advantages and Disadvantages of Pay and Display

Advantages	Disadvantages
Easy, low cost management and enforcement	It requires the user to commit to a length of stay
Limited amount of equipment required	Unused time has to be paid for
Ease of understanding and use	Inflexible in that users must decide how long they wish to park for when they initially park their vehicle
Allows the differential definition of short and long stay parking which can be preferable in some instances e.g. at Beehive Lane car park level 1 is short stay only to be make the car park more attractive to shoppers	
Free parking for disabled users can be offered	

6.5.14. **Table 30** summarises the advantages and disadvantages of a Pay on Foot or pay on exit method of payment:-

Table 30:- Advantages and Disadvantages of Pay on Foot

Advantages	Disadvantages
Users are not restricted to a particular length of stay once they have parked.	Increased equipment costs to upgrade when compared to pay and display.
Users do not have to find a machine and then return to their vehicle to display a ticket.	Lack of human security presence.
Users may spend more time (and money) in the town if they do not have to return to their car by a particular time.	Increased amount of space required to install equipment (barriers).
Users can pay when they leave, which may be more convenient if cash is used. Card payment is just as convenient before as after.	Queuing more likely at entry and egress as vehicles are required to stop longer at the barrier.
Loses the differential definition of short / long stay parking so people can park for longer if they want.	Free parking for disabled users cannot be offered.

- 6.5.15. A representative of Leicestershire Constabulary confirmed that in his experience the method of payment at a particular car park does not have an impact upon the crime rate at the car park.
- 6.5.16. In terms of capacity of car park barriers The Institution of Structural Engineers 'Design Recommendations for Multi-Storey and Underground Car Parks' suggests that a car park barrier has a maximum throughput capacity of 450 vehicles per hour. It does however note that this capacity could be reduced by up to 20% to allow for local conditions (i.e. where geometry may impede vehicle throughput). A 20% reduction in capacity means a barrier has a throughput capacity of approximately 360 vehicles per hour.
- 6.5.17. **The most appropriate solution for Loughborough is considered to be a combination of pay and display and pay on foot car parks.** Although traders are in support of a change to pay on foot the response from the town centre users survey wasn't as conclusive (although it is appreciated that not all town centre users questioned will be car users).
- 6.5.18. The feasibility of introducing a pay on foot method of payment at other car parks is discussed in this section.

Beehive Lane Car Park

6.5.19. CBC carried out a comparison of pay on exit with pay and display during the design process of the car park and a review was undertaken in December 1999. The decision was taken to improve the pay and display machines rather than introducing pay on exit / pay on foot for the following reasons:-

- Entry to the car park would require redesigning to accommodate an additional barrier
- Delays caused by vehicles queuing to enter the car park could extend onto Woodgate. Anecdotal evidence suggests that during busy Christmas periods this can happen under the existing arrangement
- Redesign of the entrance would result in a loss of approximately 17 spaces
- Car park redesign would result in the closure of the Woodgate exit

6.5.20. CBC estimated the cost of introducing a pay on exit method of payment at the car park as shown in **Table 31**:-

Table 31:- CBC's estimated cost for introducing pay on exit at Beehive Lane car park

Item	One-Off Capital Cost	Annual Revenue Cost
Equipment	£55,000 - £60,000	
Redesign of entry / exits and new signage	£15,000	
Loss of annual income due to a reduction in spaces		£10,200
Loss of annual income due to changes to operational practices		£37,000
Total	£75,000 - £80,000	£47,200

6.5.21. Beehive Lane Car Park is CBCs flagship car park with 'Park Mark' status. Given that it has a total of 590 spaces (54% of CBCs overall public car parking provision in Loughborough) it is important that usage of this car park is maximised.

6.5.22. The existing car park has 1 entry (no barrier) and 3 exit barriers. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the exit barriers operate satisfactorily without significant queues occurring because of the barrier. Under a pay on foot system a slightly longer delay could occur at the barriers since drivers are required to insert a ticket into a machine in order to operate the barrier. A pay on foot system with 2 entry and 2 exit barriers is in operation at The Rushes car park. Occupancy levels at The Rushes car park are slightly higher than at Beehive Lane car park and anecdotal evidence suggests that the barriers operate

satisfactorily without significant queues occurring because of them. The distribution of vehicle arrival and departure times at Beehive Lane car park is likely to be evenly spread throughout the hour. Therefore, barrier capacity should not be a problem at Beehive Lane car park (2 entry barriers, 3 exit barriers).

- 6.5.23. Southfield Road currently operates in a one-way direction away from the A6. The TCMP proposes that Southfield Road becomes two-way regardless of whether Beehive Lane car park operates as a pay and display or a pay on foot car park. It is anticipated that this will have a negative impact upon the operation of the Beehive Lane arm of the Southfield Road / Beehive Lane priority junction due to increased traffic flows along Southfield Road. Modelling information provided by LCC indicates that flows along Southfield Road in 2010 will be approximately double the 2005 flows. The egresses of the existing car park are onto Beehive Lane and Woodgate. All traffic exiting onto Beehive Lane must then join Southfield Road. It is anticipated that traffic would regularly queue into the internal layout of the existing car park with Southfield Road operating two-way. The LCC traffic model did not model the car park access / egress with Southfield Road operating two-way. It is therefore difficult to accurately estimate what the likely impact of Southfield Road becoming two-way actually is.

Southfield Road remains one-way

- 6.5.24. Although the TCMP proposes that Southfield Road becomes two-way it is worthwhile considering the operation of the car park with Southfield Road remaining one-way. It is understood that there are few queuing problems at present and site observations support this. However, it is noted that in peak times during the approach to Christmas traffic has been observed to queue from the car park access onto Woodgate. There is no reason to suggest the car park would not continue to operate successfully as a pay and display car park in the future should Southfield Road remain one-way.
- 6.5.25. The existing car park has 1 entry from Beehive Lane. There are no entry barriers. There is 1 exit barrier onto Woodgate and there are 2 exit barriers onto Beehive Lane. A pay on foot system ideally requires at least 2 entry and 2 exit barriers. This is to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to operate satisfactorily during peak times of barrier throughput. It also ensures that if a barrier breaks down or requires maintenance there will be a barrier in operation. If a car park has a single barrier which is out of order car park charges cannot be enforced and the car park operates without charge until the barrier is operating again. If Southfield Road remains one-way some works will still be required to the internal layout of the car park to allow for a pay on foot method of payment to be implemented. In order to achieve this with the least disruption to the existing car park it is recommended that a second entry barrier is installed at the existing access from Beehive Lane with the existing

egress onto Beehive Lane remaining. The existing exit onto Woodgate would remain. The method of circulation within the car park would remain largely as existing with the only amendments being in the vicinity of the disabled spaces on level 1. The proposal involves replacing 9 standard spaces with 6 disabled spaces on level 1 to compensate for the reduction caused by changes to circulation. The overall reduction in the number of standard spaces is 9. There is no reduction in the number of disabled spaces. The layout has 2 entry barriers and 3 exit barriers and is shown in **Appendix J**.

- 6.5.26. To re-locate the entry and / or egress would require significant works and incur greater financial costs. Furthermore, the internal circulation of traffic within the car park is likely to require amending. As such the options considered relate to utilising the existing access and egress locations.
- 6.5.27. **If Southfield Road remains one-way it is feasible for the car park to continue to operate in its existing form as a pay and display car park. However it is recommended that a pay on foot system is introduced.** It should be noted that the existing provision of the ground floor of the car park being only available to short stay users (less than 2 hours) will be lost with a pay on foot system. **It is recommended that security staff continue to patrol Beehive Lane car park with a pay on foot system in operation.**

Southfield Road made two-way

- 6.5.28. **Should Southfield Road become two-way it is recommended that modelling work is undertaken by LCC in relation to the operation of Beehive Lane Car Park access and egress locations and the operation of the Southfield Road / Beehive Lane junction.** If Southfield Road becomes two-way as proposed in the TCMP it is anticipated that the existing Southfield Road / Beehive Lane junction will operate above capacity with queues extending along Beehive Lane and also into the internal layout of the existing car park. The introduction of a pay on foot system would not reduce queue lengths or improve the operation of the Southfield Road / Beehive Lane junction. The introduction of traffic signals at the Southfield Road / Beehive Lane junction may reduce queues along Beehive Lane but given the close proximity of the car park egress to the Southfield Road / Beehive Lane junction queuing into the internal layout of the car park would occur on a regular basis. It is therefore considered inappropriate to introduce traffic signals at the Southfield Road / Beehive Lane junction. If Southfield Road becomes two-way it is anticipated that the egress from Beehive Lane is made a left turn only. This isn't ideal as all traffic exiting the car park is required to travel towards the A6. To address this issue the possibility of making Woodgate two-way between the car park egress and its junction with Southfield Road could be worth integrating as an option. This would allow traffic exiting the car park to turn left or

right onto Woodgate. Traffic signals could be introduced at the Southfield Road / Woodgate junction to enable it to operate within capacity. Although queuing would be likely along Woodgate this would not extend into the internal layout of the car park.

- 6.5.29. A pay on foot system could be introduced at the car park as outlined in paragraph 6.5.25. Because of the likely capacity problems associated with the Southfield Road / Beehive Lane junction it is **recommended that the movement from Beehive Lane is made left turn only.**
- 6.5.30. The possibility of taking access to the car park from Woodgate for a pay on foot method of payment has been considered but is unfeasible without major internal works to the car park. The existing barrier location would need re-locating inside the internal layout of the car park so vehicles queuing to enter the car park do not queue back onto Woodgate. Furthermore, having an access / egress to / from Woodgate as well as an access / egress to / from Beehive Lane has implications on the internal circulation of traffic within the car park, whereby the movements between access / egress points and the internal ramps would become undesirable.
- 6.5.31. **If Southfield Road becomes two-way it is recommended that access to Beehive Lane Car Park is taken from Beehive Lane with an egress onto Beehive Lane and another onto Woodgate.** Both pay and display, and pay on foot payment methods would be feasible under this arrangement. **Under this situation it is recommended that a pay on foot method of payment is introduced at Beehive Lane car park.**
- 6.5.32. The estimated financial cost of introducing a pay on foot method of payment at Beehive Lane Car Park is summarised in **Table 32** as follows:-

Table 32:- Financial implications of Pay on Foot at Beehive Lane Car Park

Expense	Pay on Foot (see note)
New equipment	£80,000
Redesign of entry / exits, new signage, and removal of pay and display system	£16,000
Loss of income due to a reduction in spaces per annum	£5,300 (see paragraph 6.5.33)
Loss of income due to changes in operational practices per annum	£24,000 (see paragraph 6.5.34)

Note:- Costs are for option 1:- Pay on foot (2 accesses from Beehive Lane. 1 egress onto Beehive Lane, and 1 egress onto Woodgate)

- 6.5.33. During the period 2005 / 2006 the average annual income per parking space at Beehive Lane car park was £592.60. Introduction of a pay on foot method of payment at this car park will reduce the number of parking spaces by 9 resulting in a total of 581 spaces. Applying the average income per space this results in a reduction in income of £5,300. However, ticket sale information indicates that during the Saturday peak hour in December 2006 the car park was 94% occupied (555 spaces). Based on the demand for parking in 2006 a reduction in the number of parking spaces by 9 will not impact upon the availability of spaces and it could be argued that there will be a negligible reduction in income as a result of a reduction in the number of spaces. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I**.
- 6.5.34. Approximately £24,000 of revenue was generated from fines during the period 2005 / 2006 at Beehive Lane car park. The majority of income from fines is generated from vehicles without a ticket and vehicles with an expired ticket. With a pay on foot option income from this source will be lost. Although some fine income will not be lost, as a worst case assessment it has been assumed that all fine income will be lost. It is likely that following the introduction of pay on foot at Beehive Lane some additional income will be generated from additional ticket sales whereby people park for longer than they previously did under the pay and display method of payment. It is considered that Beehive Lane car park is similar in nature to The Rushes car park. The duration of stay of vehicles in both car parks would give an insight into the difference in behaviour of users parking in a pay on foot car park and a pay and display car park and form the basis of estimating any additional income likely to be generated following the introduction of pay on foot. Unfortunately recent changes to the computer system at The Rushes car park mean that car park data from this car park is unavailable and no estimate of additional income from vehicles parking for

longer has been made. Furthermore, the high profile negative public views associated with fines should be removed by a pay on foot system.

- 6.5.35. The impact on overall car park occupancy in Loughborough resulting from a reduction in the number parking spaces at Beehive Lane with Pay on Foot is as shown below in **Table 33**:-

Table 33:- 2016 and 2021 Overall Percentage Parking Occupancy Levels – (TCMP plus Parking Strategy recommendations including Beehive Lane Pay on Foot proposals)

Percentage Occupancy											
2016						2021					
November			December			November			December		
Wed	Thur	Sat	Wed	Thur	Sat	Wed	Thur	Sat	Wed	Thur	Sat
55	66	92	72	86	107	57	69	96	75	89	112

Note:- The results in Table 33 do not assume any modal shift targets.

- 6.5.36. The results in **Table 33** indicate a marginal increase in occupancy levels resulting from a reduction in the number of parking spaces at Beehive Lane Car Park when compared to the results in **Table 25**. If the number of parking spaces at Beehive Lane Car Park is reduced by 9, no additional parking provision is recommended.
- 6.5.37. The introduction of a pay on foot method of payment at Beehive Lane car park would make it difficult to enforce short stay parking on level 1. When vehicles park in a pay on foot car park a ticket is not displayed on the vehicle indicating when the vehicle arrived in the car park. **As such it is recommended that the distinction between short and long stay parking is removed at Beehive Lane car park.**
- 6.5.38. The introduction of a pay on foot system would make it difficult to enforce a 'no return within one hour' restriction. The system itself cannot identify the behaviour of individual vehicles. It should also be noted that all users (including disabled users) will be required to pay for parking.

Granby Street Car Park

- 6.5.39. The TCMP proposes re-development of land in the vicinity of Granby Street. Granby Street car park provides an important role in the overall provision of town centre parking. The car park is one of the more popular town centre car parks offering convenient town centre parking in close proximity to key facilities. A large proportion of disabled parking is provided at Granby Street car park. In addition Granby Street car park provides the majority of parking spaces in this area of town and is the most conveniently located car park for traffic approaching from the Forest Road direction. **It is recommended that the existing**

capacity of 183 spaces is maintained. Depending on the nature of the development proposals the new car park could be a surface level or a multi-storey car park.

- 6.5.40. **It is recommended that Granby Street car park remains as a short stay car park but the maximum stay should be increased to 3 hours.** A 3 hour maximum stay will ensure an adequate turnover of spaces for 'shoppers' and prevent cars from parking all day. The convenience of the car park should increase as users will be able to stay for a longer period of time than at present. Two payment methods have been considered.

Option 1:- Park and Pay

- 6.5.41. Lincoln City Council, York City Council, and Salisbury District Council are 3 of a number of local authorities operating a 'Park and Pay' system provided by Verrus. Users can pay for parking using their mobile phone to call or text rather than using the ticket machine. Users will be sent a text message reminding them that their ticket is soon to expire giving them the option of 'topping up' their tariff from wherever they may be. All payments are deducted from their credit / debit card. A charge is applied to each payment of 10p for a stay less than £2.00, and 20p for a stay longer than £2.00. This additional payment is received by Verrus. Parking attendants can check the validity of a ticket using a handheld ticketing machine. When an attendant comes to a parked vehicle, they will check the parking area's location number on their handheld device and confirm that the vehicle's license plate is of a vehicle that belongs to someone who has paid to park. The attendant can also check how much time has been paid for and whether or not a fine should be issued. The handheld devices are also compatible with the majority of existing pay and display systems. These can be rented from Verrus for £15.00 per month (£180.00 per year). An annual cost of £360.00 has been assumed to allow for 2 devices.
- 6.5.42. Existing pay and display machines would continue to operate alongside any Park and Pay system. There will be some costs for new signing estimated to be approximately £1,000.
- 6.5.43. Consultation exercises revealed that one of the key frustrations with pay and display amongst traders and car park users is the requirement to return to their vehicles for a specified time period. **Recommendation:- that a 6 month trial period is introduced at Granby Street car park. It is recommended that following a Park and Pay trial period the system should be introduced at other pay and display car parks.** A Park and Pay system would operate alongside Pay and Display.

Option 2:- Pay on Foot

- 6.5.44. The existing Granby Street Car Park operates as a pay and display car park. The feasibility of installing a pay on foot system for a surface level or multi-storey car park has been explored. Whilst it is feasible to install the required equipment, consideration would need to be given to the likely queue lengths associated with vehicles queuing to enter and exit the car park. Ticket sale information from CBC indicates that during the peak hour in December car park arrivals were below 360 vehicles per hour (barrier throughput capacity of 1 barrier). The distribution of vehicle arrival times is likely to be evenly spread throughout the hour. Therefore, if a single entry and exit barrier was installed capacity should not be a problem. Nevertheless it is recommended that a new Granby Street car park should have 2 entry and 2 exit barriers to ensure that during times when a barrier is out of order there will still be a barrier in operation. The financial cost of installing a pay on foot equipment with 2 entry and 2 exit barriers would be approximately £70,000. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I**.
- 6.5.45. Installing 2 entry and 2 exit barriers would require removal of existing footways and the probable loss of 2 trees. The internal layout of the car park would need re-configuring at the expense of a number of car parking spaces. The existing cycle parking stands would need relocating. There could also be an impact on the location of the existing PTW parking stands. It is considered inappropriate to reduce the number of parking spaces at this car park. In order to implement a pay on foot method of payment it would be recommended that 2 entry and 2 exit barriers are installed to prevent the possibility of lost income because a barrier is out of order. Because 2 barriers cannot be installed at the existing car park without the number of spaces being reduced **it is recommended that the existing Granby Street car park remains as a pay and display car park.**
- 6.5.46. The feasibility of installing a pay on foot system for a surface level or multi-storey car park has been explored. Whilst it is feasible as part of the re-design of the car park to install the required equipment, consideration would need to be given to the likely queue lengths associated with vehicles queuing to enter and exit the car park. Ticket sale information from CBC indicates that during the peak hour in December car park arrivals were below 360 vehicles per hour (barrier throughput capacity of 1 barrier). The distribution of vehicle arrival times is likely to be evenly spread throughout the hour. Therefore if a single entry and exit barrier was installed capacity should not be a problem. Nevertheless it is recommended that a new Granby Street car park should have 2 entry and 2 exit barriers to ensure that during times when a barrier is out of order there will still be a barrier in operation. The financial cost of installing a pay on foot equipment with 2 entry and 2 exit barriers would be approximately £70,000. It is important to bear in mind that the introduction of a pay on foot system would make it difficult to enforce a 'no return within one hour' restriction. The

system itself cannot identify the behaviour of individual vehicles. **It is recommended that if a new multi-storey car park is constructed along Granby Street it is designed as a pay on foot car park.**

New Car Parks

- 6.5.47. The new IRR Car Park could be designed as a pay on foot car park. However, this may prove not to be financially viable for a surface level car park given the likely number of spaces. **If the car park is developed as a multi-storey car park it is recommended that this car park is designed as a pay on foot car park.**
- 6.5.48. The provision of a new surface level car park in front of the leisure centre adjacent to Browns Lane is discussed in paragraphs 6.3.3 to 6.3.11. Implementing a pay on foot method of payment would require a reduction in the number of spaces to the number that could be achieved with a pay and display method of payment. This would compromise the financial viability of the site. Furthermore, if barriers were incorporated into the layout there would be insufficient space for queuing vehicles. **As such it is recommended that the new Browns Lane Car Park operates as a pay and display car park.**

Other CBC Car Parks

- 6.5.49. The layout and capacity of Macaulay House Car Park are such that introducing a pay on foot method of payment at this car park cannot be justified and is therefore not recommended. Furthermore, the existing lease on the car park expires in 2010.
- 6.5.50. The existing Pinfold Gate and Southfield Extension car parks are to be closed as outlined in the TCMP. **In the meantime it is not recommended that any amendments are made to the payment method at either of these car parks.**

Discounted Tickets / Permit Holders

- 6.5.51. It is recommended that a Green Badge scheme is introduced whereby vehicles with low Carbon Dioxide emissions receive a 25% reduction by way of a discounted ticket or permit. This has been outlined in paragraph 5.5.6 for Southfield Offices and should extend to all permits and discounted tickets that CBC issue. Drivers of vehicles with carbon dioxide emissions below 120g/km would receive a 25% discount of parking. Whilst using public transport, walking, and cycling are the most sustainable mode of travel it is recognised that these are not practical for everyone. Reduced parking charges are a good way of rewarding drivers who contribute to reducing emissions of gases that cause climate change.

Existing Privately Operated Public Car Parks

- 6.5.52. The Rushes car park currently operates with a pay on foot method of payment. This is considered suitable. The method of payment at Sainsbury's has recently been changed from pay on foot to become a free car park with a maximum stay of 3 hours. It is recommended that discussions are held between CBC and Sainsbury's with a view to re-introducing parking charges at this car park.
- 6.5.53. Carillon Court Car Park currently has a single access barrier and a single egress barrier. Although it operates as a pay and display car park it is anticipated that these barriers could be replaced with the barrier types required for a pay on foot car park. However, the car park has a shared access / egress ramp providing a link between the car park and the carriageway which make it impossible to have 2 access and 2 egress barriers without major structural work being undertaken on the car park. **It is not considered suitable that a pay on foot method of payment is installed at this car park.**
- 6.5.54. Regent Place Car Park has two accesses and two egresses. There are no barriers at present. Whilst it appears feasible that barriers could be introduced with adequate queuing space the appropriateness of introducing barriers at this car park is debateable. Introducing a pay on foot system would cost approximately £70,000 and is considered to be an unnecessary expense in this instance. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I. It is not considered suitable that a pay on foot method of payment is installed at this car park.**

Disabled Parking Charges

- 6.5.55. Under existing conditions all CBC public car parks are free for disabled users with no time restrictions. Of the privately operated public car parks only The Rushes (pay on foot) charges for disabled users. **It is not proposed to introduce charges for disabled users from an equity point of view.** Within CBC car parks and for on-street spaces there are no time restrictions for disabled users parking in disabled parking spaces. The occupancy surveys demonstrate that capacity of on-street disabled parking spaces is not a problem. Whilst the occupancy of disabled parking spaces cannot be determined from the ticketing information at CBC public car parks on-site observations suggest that capacity of disabled spaces is not a problem. **As such it is not proposed that changes are made to the maximum length of stay permitted in disabled parking spaces.**

Shopmobility

- 6.5.56. As stated in paragraph 2.1.4, CBC's lease of Macaulay House ends in 2010. As such a new location for shopmobility spaces is required. A review of the scope to include this within the old Magistrates Court or Granby Street car park is recommended. Shopmobility could be incorporated into the re-development of land in the vicinity of Devonshire Square as part of improvements to Granby Street car park. Beehive Lane car park is not a recommended location because of the need for shopmobility users to cross Woodgate.

Summary of Method of Payment

- 6.5.57. All new multi-storey car parks should be constructed as pay on foot car parks. The Rushes car park should remain as a pay on foot car park. It is recommended that a pay on foot is introduced at Beehive Lane car park.
- 6.5.58. The existing Browns Lane car park should operate as a pay and display car park with 2-part tickets.
- 6.5.59. The proposed new car park adjacent to Browns Lane in the vicinity of the leisure centre should operate as a pay and display car park.
- 6.5.60. All remaining existing car parks should continue to operate as pay and display car parks. A 6 month trial period of a park and pay system should operate alongside the existing pay and display system at the existing Granby Street car park with a view to installing this system at other car parks if it proves successful.
- 6.5.61. If Beehive Lane car park becomes a pay on foot car park, this leaves the existing Granby Street car park as the only short stay car park. **It is recommended that the short stay designation remains at this car park.**

6.6. Locational Distribution of Parking Spaces

- 6.6.1. A significant amount of town centre car parking is located towards the northern end of the town centre with The Rushes, Carillon Court, Sainsbury's, and Regent Place car parks all providing a large number of parking spaces which are ideally located for traffic approaching from the A6 (north) or A512. However, this isn't unexpected given the greater number of amenities in this area of the town.
- 6.6.2. Beehive Lane, Browns Lane, and Granby Street car parks are located towards the southern end of the town centre. Parking numbers here are less than those available towards the north of town, particularly when considering that the ticket sale information at Browns Lane car park demonstrates that the car park does not operate as a town centre car park.

6.6.3. Despite the greater concentration of parking numbers towards the north of the town centre it is not considered to represent a significant problem. **However, it is recommended that in the future any new car parking should be located away from the north of the town centre given the existing concentration of parking spaces in this area.**

6.7. On-Street Parking

6.7.1. Leicestershire County Council has confirmed that there are currently no plans to introduce on-street parking charges in Loughborough. There are advantages and disadvantages to having free on-street parking or introducing on-street parking charges.

6.7.2. Free on-street parking can result in additional traffic circulating the town centre 'searching' for a free space when off-street spaces are available. This increases congestion and worsens environmental conditions. The provision of free parking can be considered as conflicting with national, regional, and local sustainable transport policies encouraging people to choose alternative modes of travel. It is difficult to do this whilst free on-street parking exists. However, traders may consider that free on-street parking is essential for the town centre economy.

6.7.3. The introduction of on-street charges would reduce the number of vehicles circulating the town centre 'searching' for an available space. Some drivers will decide to park in a car park rather than paying to park on-street or will be encouraged to support local policies and use alternative modes of travel. This can have a positive effect in that the availability of on-street parking spaces will increase and those drivers who are more in need of an on-street space will be able to find an available one. On-street charges may also be introduced to provide a consistent on-street and off-street charging tariff.

6.7.4. The introduction of on-street charges would involve a purchase cost for equipment of approximately £5,500 per machine. Based on the number of on-street spaces outlined in the TCMP it is estimated that 35 machines will be required to cover the network of on-street parking spaces in the town centre. Maintenance is estimated at £300 per year for each machine. As such the estimated cost for equipment is £192,500 with maintenance estimated to cost approximately £12,250 per year. A similar analysis was undertaken by JMP Consultants on behalf of CBC as part of their 'Boroughwide Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Preliminary Study'. This was undertaken before the TCMP was developed. JMP estimated that 37 pay and display machines would be required (£203,500 equipment costs and £11,800 annual maintenance costs).

- 6.7.5. **In the short term it is recommended that no charges are made for on-street parking.** On-street parking areas in Loughborough are intended for short stay parking only. Following the introduction of CPE it is likely that these vehicles currently parking for a longer period of time than permitted will either park in a car park, or park for a length of stay in keeping with the maximum time permitted. Because of this it is likely that vehicles will begin to park in accordance with the restrictions and the turnover of spaces should increase. This should reduce the number of vehicles circulating the town centre searching for a space. If the introduction of CPE proves to be a success in this respect it is not considered necessary to introduce on-street parking charges at this stage.
- 6.7.6. **Once CPE has been in operation for 1 year, a review of the success of CPE should be undertaken. As part of the review it is recommended that the scope for introducing on-street parking charges should be investigated and discussed with LCC as necessary.** It is important to bear in mind that on-street charges should be less than off-street charges. This is because issues such as vehicle security are of a higher standard in off-street parking areas than on-street parking areas. Furthermore, the cost of equipment and maintenance will be a crucial factor in the feasibility of introducing on-street charges. The length of stay of vehicles parking on-street is likely to be very short. As such if on-street charges are introduced it would be advisable to introduce a 30 minute tariff to enable those wishing to undertake a very short trip to be able to do so without being frustrated by having to pay for 1 hour of parking.
- 6.7.7. The 'Boroughwide Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Preliminary Study' undertaken by JMP Consultants estimated that on-street parking charges would generate an additional income of £141,800 per year. This is based on each vehicle parking for 1 hour at an hourly charge of 50p. This equates to 283,600 vehicle hours per year.
- 6.7.8. Based on WYG on-street occupancy and duration survey results an estimate of the number of vehicles parking on-street during a week in January has been made. Results have been reduced by 10% to factor in displacement of traffic following the introduction of CPE. The results are shown in **Table 34** as follows:-

Table 34:- Estimated Number Of Vehicles Parking In On-Street Spaces In January

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Total
912	912	912	918	912	1304	5870

Note:- Results for the Wednesday survey have been duplicated for Monday, Tuesday, and Friday.

- 6.7.9. An estimate of the number of vehicles likely to park on-street during the year has been made. Ticket sale information for the period 2005 / 2006 has been obtained from CBC. This indicates that January is the third busiest month of the year. Earlier in this report it has

been established that November is a typical month of the year. As such a factor of 0.8963 has been derived from the ticket sale information to convert the January data into November data. Because data for November is considered to be representative of a typical month of the year, data for a week has been multiplied by 12 to obtain an estimate of the number of vehicles likely to park on-street during the year. It is estimated that 273,572 vehicles park on-street throughout the year. Assuming each vehicle is charged a standard tariff of 50p the estimated revenue to be generated would be approximately £136,786 per year. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I**. WYG's estimate of the amount of revenue likely to be generated from applying on-street parking charges is similar to the estimate made by JMP with WYG's estimate being £5,000 less than JMP's.

6.7.10. JMP estimated that 12 parking attendants would be required to enforce parking restrictions in Loughborough as part of the CPE process. It would be the responsibility of the Parking Manager to monitor how many attendants would be required. JMP estimated that an average of 5.2 parking notices would need to be issued per attendant to ensure the requirement to have an attendant. The introduction of on-street charges should not occur until CPE has been in operation for at least 1 year. By this time the Parking Manager should have a good understanding of the number of attendants required and an appreciation of the number of additional staff required (if any) to enforce the charges. The typical salary of a parking attendant is in the region of £15,000 per year.

6.8. New Residential Parking Areas

6.8.1. LCC have confirmed that resident preferential parking areas are being considered along Albert Promenade, in the vicinity of the forthcoming IRR, and in the vicinity of the railway station. It is anticipated that a scheme along Albert Promenade would be implemented during 2009. **It is recommended that CBC liaise with LCC as appropriate regarding any new resident preferential parking areas being implemented.** It is important that permits are only issued to residents with vehicles to reduce the risk of permits being sold to commuters. This would be particularly important in the vicinity of the railway station where people will travel here on a daily basis. Under the existing scheme additional permits can be purchased at a cost of £20 per household. It is important that these applications are carefully checked to minimise the possibility of the permits being sold to non-residents, thus defeating the object of the scheme.

6.9. Disabled Parking

6.9.1. Overall the existing provision of disabled parking is below the provision outlined in existing guidance. However, the existing distribution of spaces is considered suitable to the requirements of town centre users given the existing concentration at Granby Street and

Macaulay House car parks given their close proximity to the town centre. There are numerous areas of double and single yellow lines where disabled vehicles can also park. Because of such areas being available throughout Loughborough the overall shortfall (based on existing guidance) in designated disabled parking spaces is not considered a problem. **However, it is recommended that following the closure of Macaulay House car park when CBC's lease expires in 2010, the 7 disabled spaces in this car park will require re-locating.** A review of the scope to include this within the old Magistrates Court, Beehive Lane car park or Granby Street car park is recommended.

- 6.9.2. Site observations in car parks and analysis of designated and un-designated on-street parking data indicates that there is a suitable level of available disabled parking spaces in the town centre.
- 6.9.3. CBC has recently produced a Development Brief for the former hospital and Aumberry Gap area, and also for the area in the vicinity of Devonshire Square. Although no specific standards are outlined with regard to the number of disabled parking spaces, both Development Briefs state the requirement for the provision of adequate and convenient car parking for disabled users.
- 6.9.4. **Recommendation: Current disabled parking provision is considered adequate. The amount and location of disabled parking spaces shall be regularly reviewed by CBC. Adequate and convenient disabled car parking at new car parks should be in accordance with the latest policy documents.**
- 6.10. Powered Two Wheelers (PTWs)
- 6.10.1. The survey of PTW parking undertaken by WYG on Thursday 25th January 2007 revealed that existing occupancy of PTW parking areas is low. Whilst it could be argued that this demonstrates that people do not wish to use a PTW to travel to Loughborough this may not be the case. The condition of existing PTW parking areas is poor and as such it is considered that people who may wish to travel by PTW may not be doing so partly because of this. **It is recommended that parking provision for PTW users is improved in order to make travel by PTW a more attractive option to those who may wish to do so.**
- 6.10.2. **Recommendation:- that a Quality PTW Parking Partnership is formed between appropriate organisations. This would represent an agreement between these organisations to work together to deliver improvements to PTW parking in Loughborough.** Suitable organisations to be included in the partnership include CBC, private car park operators, Police, and motorcycle user groups. As an initial basis for discussion it is recommended that the number of stands at Granby Street Car Park is

maintained, additional PTW stands should be provided at The Rushes and Sainsbury's car parks. Research should be undertaken to identify the full range of stands available and the most appropriate type for Loughborough. To make the stands more attractive it is also recommended that shelters are provided where appropriate.

- 6.10.3. **Provision for PTW parking within new developments will continue to be assessed as part of the planning application process and it is recommended that LCC's standards as outlined in 'Highways, transportation and development, (Htd) for PTW parking provision are adopted. The provision of PTW parking facilities at the new IRR Car Park should be assessed against these standards. Shelters should be provided with all new PTW stands.**

6.11. Cycle Parking

- 6.11.1. Cycle use in Loughborough is considered to be high, particularly amongst the large student population. Section 2.20 presented the results of a survey undertaken of cycle stand usage during a Thursday lunchtime in January. This found that 55 cycles were secured to the 170 available stands. Cycles were also observed secured to railings in areas of the town centre where cycle stands are not located. It is considered that cycle usage was probably lower when these surveys were undertaken and that cycle usage is likely to be greater during warmer months of the year than January (when the survey was undertaken).

- 6.11.2. **It is recommended that covered cycle parking is provided at key strategic locations.** This includes the 8 existing stands at the Granby Street Car Park and the 20 existing stands in the upper level of The Rushes Car Park.

- 6.11.3. **Cycle parking should be provided as part of the re-development at Devonshire Square and the Former Hospital/Aumberry Gap sites as per the Development Briefs for both sites.** These state that:-

"Cycle storage/parking must be located as close as possible to main entrances of offices, shops, healthcare facilities etc., offering a real advantage over the nearest public car parking. Locations should be under constant natural surveillance/CCTV and well lit. 'Sheffield' type stands large enough to allow bike frames and wheels to be secured are the preferred parking facility."

"Under cover and secure cycle parking facilities should also be provided for residential properties, preferably within the building envelope. For this key Town Centre location cycle parking provision well in excess of the current minimum requirement for residential development (i.e. one space for every five dwellings) will be expected. A provision of one

space per residential unit and, in the case of student accommodation, one space per two resident students is considered desirable.”

- 6.11.4. **Covered cycle parking should be provided at the Market Place / Granby Street junction to replace the existing stands.**
- 6.11.5. **It is also recommended that covered cycle parking is provided as part of the redevelopment of Bedford Square to replace the existing stands.**
- 6.11.6. **It is also recommended that the 8 existing stands located in the vicinity of the Biggin Street / Swan Street junction are covered.**
- 6.11.7. The existing cycle stands located along Market Street are located at intervals. Whilst this benefits cyclists as they can park in the vicinity of a particular shop it means cyclists are cycling along a pedestrianised area which can be a hazard / annoyance to pedestrians. At the time of the survey these stands weren't particularly well used. **In the interests of improving the environment for pedestrians it is recommended that cycle parking along Market Street is located in the vicinity of the Market Street / Ashby Square junction.** This will also serve the redeveloped Ashby Square / Derby Square area.
- 6.11.8. **It is recommended that new stands are provided in the interior of the new IRR Car Park.**
- 6.11.9. **It is recommended that Sheffield Stands are used where new stands are installed.**
- 6.11.10. The recommendations outlined in paragraphs 6.11.2 to 6.11.9 represent an overall increase in cycle parking in the town centre and an improvement in the quality of parking. It is anticipated that these improvements will generate an increase in cycle tips to / from the town centre and will therefore contribute towards achieving future modal shift targets.
- 6.11.11. A Charnwood Cycle Forum already exists. This represents an agreement between relevant organisations to work together in order to deliver improvements for cyclists. **It is recommended that the issues outlined in this section are discussed by the Charnwood Cycle Forum.**
- 6.11.12. **Provision for cycle parking within new developments will continue to be assessed as part of the planning application process and it is recommended that as a minimum LCC Htd standards for cycle parking provision are adopted to achieve increase travel by walking, cycling and public transport for trips to and from the town centre.**

The provision of cycle parking facilities at the new IRR Car Park should be assessed against these standards. Shelters should be provided with all new cycle stands.

6.12. Maximum Parking Standards For New Development

- 6.12.1. The relevant parking standards that would be applied to any new developments in the town centre as part of the planning application process currently differs between the various planning guidance documents for some use classes (where these documents have standards for the same use class of development); with the adopted Local Plan containing slightly different standards to those in the PPG13 and the RSS documents. **It is therefore recommended that where the current parking standards in the Local Plan are less restrictive than the same use class in the national and regional guidance that these are revised in the emerging LDF to accord with the PPG13 and RSS guidance.** Existing parking standards are presented in **Appendix G**. It should be noted that LCC maximum standards are consistent with PPG13 and / or the RSS. A summary of the existing parking standards and the standards being recommended as part of this Parking Strategy is shown in **Table 35** as follows:-

Table 35:- Summary of Existing and Proposed Maximum Recommended Parking Standards

Development Use Class	Other Details	Guidance			Recommended Standard
		PPG13 / PPS3	RSS	Existing CBC	
A1 Shops		1 space per 14sqm for food retail above 1,000sqm and 1 space per 20sqm for non-food retail above 1,000sqm		1 space per 9sqm above 3,000sqm	PPG13
				1 space per 12sqm between 1,000sqm and 3,000sqm	PPG13
				1 space per 30sqm between 300 and 1,000sqm	Existing CBC
				2 spaces up to 100sqm, 1 space per additional 100sqm thereafter below 300sqm	Existing CBC
A2 Financial and professional	Offices			1 space per 35sqm	Existing CBC
A3	Restaurants			1 customer space per 4sqm of public area plus 1 staff space per 20 tables of 40sqm	Existing CBC
	Public Houses and Licensed Clubs			1 customer space per 3sqm of public area plus 1 space per residential member of staff and 1 space per 40sqm of public area for non-residential staff	Existing CBC
B1 Business	Offices	1 space per 30sqm	1 space per 60sqm above 2500sqm	1 space per 25sqm	RSS
	Research and Development	1 space per 30sqm	1 space per 60sqm above 2500sqm	1 space per 30sqm	RSS
	Light Industry			1 space per 50sqm	Existing CBC
B2 General Industry	Industry		1 space per 130sqm	1 space per 50sqm	RSS
B8 Storage and Distribution	Warehouses		1 space per 300sqm	1 space per 100sqm. For developments over 9,300sqm 1 space per 150sqm	RSS
C1 Hotels	Hotels			1 space per bedroom	Existing CBC
C2 Residential Institutions	Nursing Home			1 space per 3 bedrooms, plus 1 space for each residential staff member on site.	Existing CBC
	Residential Homes for the elderly with communal facilities			1 space per 4 bedrooms, plus 1 space for each residential staff member on site	Existing CBC

C3 Dwelling Houses	4 or more bedrooms	1.5 per dwelling		3 spaces in Local Plan. 1 space per dwelling in Devonshire Sq and Aumberry gap Development Briefs (see para. 6.12.3)	PPS3 / CBC (see note)
	3 or less bedrooms	1.5 per dwelling		2 spaces in Local Plan. 1 space per dwelling in Devonshire Sq and Aumberry gap Development Briefs (see para. 6.12.3)	PPS3 / CBC (see note)
	Local Authority / Housing Association developments with 2 or less bedrooms	1.5 per dwelling		3 spaces per 2 dwellings in Local Plan. 1 space per dwelling in Devonshire Sq and Aumberry gap Development Briefs (see para. 6.12.3)	PPS3 / CBC (see note)
	Retirement dwellings for over 55's and dwellings with off-site warden			1 space per dwelling plus 1 visitor space per 4 dwellings	Existing CBC
	On-site warden controlled			1 space per 2 dwellings	Existing CBC
D1 Non-residential institutions	Surgeries and clinics			1 space pr member of staff plus 2 spaces per consulting room / surgery	Existing CBC
	Conference Centres (PPG13 includes cinemas)	1 space per 5 seats	As per PPG13	2 spaces per 3 fixed seats or 1 space per 3sqm	PPG13
	Exhibition Halls			1 space per 6sqm	Existing CBC
	Libraries			1 space per staff member plus 1 space per 25sqm	Existing CBC
	Schools			1 space per member of teaching staff plus 3 additional spaces	Existing CBC
	Day Nurseries			1 space per staff member plus 1 additional space	Existing CBC
	Higher and Further Education	1 space per 2 staff plus 1 space per 15 students	As per PPG13		PPG13 / PPG3
D2 Assembly and Leisure	Sports Grounds and Clubs			Varies – see Appendix H	Existing CBC
	Golf Courses			100 spaces per 18 hole course	Existing CBC
	Stadia	1 space per 15 seats	As per PPG13		PPG13
D2 (other than cinema, conference facilities, and cinema)		1 space per 22sqm	As per PPG13		PPG13

Note: - The Devonshire Square and Aumberry gap Development Briefs indicate a maximum of 1 space per dwelling. This standard should be applied for all residential developments of a similar nature

- 6.12.2. The recommended standards presented in **Table 35** should be treated as the maximum provision allowed and should be taken forward into the emerging LDF. In many instances a level of provision below the standards presented may be considered more appropriate i.e. no parking may be considered appropriate for a town centre office development situated within a good network of footways and cycleway and adjacent to a bus stop served by frequent bus services.
- 6.12.3. The Development Briefs for the Devonshire Square and Former Hospital / Aumberry Gap development sites indicate that parking provision must take into account current RSS and LCC guidance. For the residential elements of each development parking should not exceed 1 space per unit. Consideration should also be given to the following:-
- The town centre location where services are readily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport;
 - The type of housing. For example, the demand for parking in accommodation for elderly people and single people is likely to be less than for family housing. In some circumstances (e.g. purpose built student housing) a no car agreement will be required;
 - Proposals involving the conversion of existing buildings where off-street parking is less likely to be successfully designed into the scheme.

Both Development Briefs state that:- “For the Opportunity Site generally no private car parking should be provided for occupiers of commercial/office development other than that which can be demonstrated to be absolutely essential. “

- 6.12.4. **It is recommended that parking provision at the Devonshire Square and Former Hospital / Aumberry Gap development sites is provided in accordance with the Development Brief for each site.**

6.13. Coach Parking

- 6.13.1. Existing coach parking is provided for 2 vehicles at Browns Lane Car Park. These are used primarily for short term parking associated with schools etc. Some concern has been raised by CBC regarding the lack of coach parking in the vicinity of the library and museum along Granby Street.
- 6.13.2. The duration surveys undertaken along Granby Street indicate that many of these spaces are currently occupied by vehicles parking for longer than the maximum time permitted with many staying for a full day. Following the introduction of CPE these vehicles will park elsewhere effectively creating additional short stay spaces. If a section of Granby Street is allocated for use by coaches at the same time as CPE is introduced it could form part of the overall CPE package.

6.13.3. On-street coach parking should be located in areas where conflict between pedestrians and coach passengers is minimised. Any coach parking should be located along the southern side of Granby Street i.e. on the opposite side of the road to building frontages in order to minimise the potential for conflict. Coach parking should be located away from access locations to Queens Park. Space for a single coach is considered suitable. **The recommended location for coach parking is opposite properties 19, 21, and 23.** This would replace 3 existing on-street vehicle parking spaces.

6.14. Park and Ride

6.14.1. Park and Ride sites can facilitate a reduction in traffic in town / city centres and along the routes into these centres. However, they may not reduce travel by car overall. Some people may choose to drive their car to a park and ride facility and catch a bus who may previously have undertaken the entire trip by public transport. The decision to provide a park and ride facility should be the subject of a detailed study which includes forecasting future travel demand / modal changes.

6.14.2. As outlined in paragraph 5.7.10 it is **recommended that a suitable location is sought for a temporary park and ride site to cater for periods of peak demand.**

6.14.3. However, it is not considered that a permanent Park and Ride scheme in Loughborough would be commercially viable at the present time. This view is substantiated by LTP2, which states that there is not a case for park and ride outside Central Leicestershire in the period to 2011. **Recommendation:- Beyond 2011 the suitability of a permanent Park and Ride for Loughborough should be reviewed giving appreciation to appropriate local policy documents.**

6.15. Market Traders

6.15.1. Some market traders park in Southfield Road Extension car park on market days. The TCMP states that this car park is the subject of potential re-development. As such market traders will be required to find alternative parking. The most appropriate alternative to this car park in terms of location would be Granby Street Car Park. However, it is also not considered desirable to have key parking spaces occupied by market trader vehicles. This car park is regularly at capacity and a reduction in spaces to cater for the requirements of market traders is unlikely to be well received by other car park users. Furthermore Granby Street Car Park is currently designated as a short stay car park. If market traders were to park here they would be required to park longer than the maximum 2 hours permitted. Therefore, it is not recommended that the market traders use Granby Street Car Park.

6.15.2. The size of many of the market trader's vehicles prevents them from using any of the multi-storey car parks. The distance between Regent Place and Sainsbury's car parks and the market area is considered to be too far for use by market traders. In addition the cost of all day parking at Regent Place car park is likely to be a deterrent. The location of the Browns Lane Car Park is considered more appropriate in terms of its location. Furthermore, space is available in this car park during times of the day when parking is required by market traders (i.e. avoiding times of peak occupancy at the leisure centre – weekday evenings) **Recommendation:- further consultation is held with the market traders with a view to providing allocated spaces on market days in the Browns Lane 'Extension' Car Park. There is likely to be spare capacity at this car park during times of the day when market traders wish to park.**

6.16. Signing

6.16.1. There is a lack of car park signing on the approaches to the town centre. **It is recommended that discussions are held between CBC and LCC (as highway authority) regarding signing. It is recommended that significant improvements are made to the existing signage in order for the Parking Strategy to prove effective.** The signing strategy should include all existing CBC and privately operated public car parks.

6.16.2. **It is recommended that discussions are held between CBC and the private car park operators in order to establish their aspirations for an improved signing strategy.** Our initial thoughts regarding a signing strategy are as follows.

Beehive Lane, Carillon Court, Granby Street, and The Rushes car parks

6.16.3. A combination of Variable Message Signs (VMS) and static signs should be installed to direct traffic to Beehive Lane, Carillon Court, Granby Street, and The Rushes car parks. These car parks have a large number of spaces and are considered to be key strategic town centre car parks.

6.16.4. It is considered that there are five key approaches to the town centre. These are from the A6 (north), the A60 Nottingham Road, the A6 (south), the B5350 Forest Road, and the A512 Ashby Road. A single VMS should be located along these routes as traffic approaches the outskirts of the town centre. **It is recommended that each of these signs displays the number of spaces available at the car parks most appropriate to the direction from which traffic is approaching the town centre.** This should help to reduce the number of vehicles circulating the town centre searching for a space. This is considered to be:-

- A6 (north) – The Rushes, Carillon Court
- A60 Nottingham Road – The Rushes, Carillon Court

- A6 (south) – Beehive Lane, Granby Street
- Forest Road – Beehive Lane, Granby Street
- Ashby Road – The Rushes, Carillon Court, Granby Street

6.16.5. Once traffic arrives in the town centre static signs should be located to direct traffic through the town centre to the car parks. Additional VMS's should be located outside the entry to Beehive Lane, Carillon Court, Granby Street, and The Rushes car parks. This sign should display the number of available spaces.

6.16.6. Static signs will be provided to direct traffic exiting a car park towards key routes out of the town centre.

Other Town Centre Car Parks

6.16.7. New static signs should be installed to direct traffic to all other town centre car parks. Signing of these car parks should be more localised than signing for Beehive Lane, Carillon Court, Granby Street, and The Rushes car parks. Static signs should show the name of each car park and a direction arrow.

6.16.8. Static signs will be provided to direct traffic exiting a car park towards a key route out of the town centre.

IRR

6.16.9. Whilst provision of the IRR impacts upon the route traffic chooses to travel through the centre of Loughborough it does not impact upon which car parks are considered most appropriate in terms of their location from each approach to the town centre. However, provision of the IRR will have an impact upon some static signs within close proximity to the IRR. **If new signing is introduced prior to the IRR being completed it is recommended that where possible any static signs likely to require re-locating are attached to existing lighting columns or sign posts in order to keep financial costs to a minimum.**

6.16.10. The estimated cost for installing all required VMS' and equipment is £178,000. A budget of £20,000 is likely to be sufficient for new static signs. The overall cost for signing is therefore estimated to be £198,000. It should be noted that this estimate assumes all signs will be new and does not include for use of any existing signs. Full calculations are presented in **Appendix I**. The scope for costs to be funded through the LTP process and private car park operators should be discussed with LCC and the private car park operators.

6.17. Car Park Quality Improvements

- 6.17.1. 'Park Mark' status was rejected at Browns Lane Car Park towards the end of 2006 primarily due to a lack of surveillance and poor maintenance. **It is recommended that improvements are made to this car park so that it achieves 'Park Mark' status.** The existing car park markings are becoming faded. New markings should be painted to assist in defining spaces. A review of the existing CCTV system should be undertaken, and efforts should be made to improve natural surveillance in the car park. Trimming of existing vegetation is likely to improve this. Improvements should be undertaken in liaison with the Association of Chief Police Officers (who award 'Park Mark' status). It is anticipated that particular attention will need to be given to the 'extension car park' to the rear of the site in relation to surveillance. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this part of the car park is perceived to be unsafe by the public. Whilst this may or may not be the case changing this perception will form a critical part of achieving 'Park Mark' status.
- 6.17.2. It is not considered worthwhile to seek 'Park Mark' status at Macaulay House Car Park given the low number of spaces at this site and also because CBC's lease is due to expire in 2010. It is also considered inappropriate to seek 'Park Mark' status at Southfield Extension and Pinfold Gate car parks given the likely closure of these car parks.
- 6.17.3. **Recommendation:- the new IRR Car Park should seek to achieve 'Park Mark' status.**
- 6.17.4. **Recommendation:- that CBC seek to achieve 'Park Mark' status at any new car parks.**
- 6.17.5. **Recommendation:- that discussions are held between CBC and the privately operated public car park managers to encourage them to seek 'Park Mark' status (with the exception of The Rushes which has 'Park Mark' status already).**
- 6.17.6. In addition to The Rushes car park, Granby Street, Pinfold Gate, and Beehive Lane car parks also have 'Park Mark' status. In terms of improvements that could be made to these car parks both Granby Street and Pinfold Gate car parks are considered to be of a good standard. Natural surveillance at Granby Street car park isn't of the highest standard but the presence of CCTV and the regular human presence associated with the high turnover of vehicles mean that the car park is under adequate observation. Beehive Lane car park is currently surveyed by CCTV until 18:00. It is understood that CCTV coverage will be extended to cover evening periods in the near future. It is recommended that internal lighting at Beehive Lane car park is made brighter.

Granby Street Car Park Access / Egress

- 6.17.7. A review of the access and egress arrangements associated with Granby Street Car Park has been undertaken given the proposed pedestrianisation along Devonshire Square. Packe Street

and Granby Street must be accessible to all vehicles. In order to access Granby Street car park via Packe Street and Granby Street vehicles are required to undertake an undesirable 'dog leg' manoeuvre. Furthermore, traffic approaching from the south-west would be required to travel a greater distance than at present, as it must travel via Browns Lane and Frederick Street. All traffic travelling from the car park must do so via the Granby Street / Frederick Street junction. Traffic flows along Frederick Street are estimated to increase following the implementation of 2-way operation along Southfield Road. It is likely that traffic could encounter difficulties exiting Granby Street. **It is recommended that modelling work is undertaken in relation to the operation of the Granby Street / Frederick Street junction to determine the capacity of this junction.**

Somerfield Car Park

- 6.17.8. The existing Somerfield Car Park is of a very poor standard. Access and egress to the car park is taken from Packe Street, although this isn't clearly signposted and involves vehicles passing through a service yard. Internally the car park is dirty, poorly lit, and in need of maintenance. There are no separate pedestrian walkways other than a stairwell and a lift which are both in a poor condition. The structure of the car park appears to be in a poor condition. Somerfield Car Park is considered to be a serious blight on the town centre environment..
- 6.17.9. It is considered wholly inappropriate for a town centre car park to be free of charge as discussed in paragraph 6.1.5. Because of its condition it is considered unlikely that people would choose to park at this car park if charges were introduced.
- 6.17.10. It is understood that discussions were held in the past between CBC and Somerfield regarding the future of the car park. **It is recommended that further discussions are held between CBC and Somerfield regarding the future of this car park. It is considered that the car park is in a prime location within the town centre and would be ideal for re-development.** The site could be re-developed to improve links to Granby Street car park and could be re-developed to provide landscaping and some car parking. There are many uncertainties associated with this recommendation and therefore the Parking Strategy has been developed on the basis that Somerfield Car park is maintained as a town centre car park.

6.18. Quality Parking Partnership

- 6.18.1. It is recommended that an overall **Quality Parking Partnership is formed for Loughborough between appropriate organisations. This would represent an agreement between these organisations to work together to deliver improvements to parking in Loughborough.** A partnership for PTWs has been recommended and one already exists for cyclists as outlined in sections 6.10 and 6.11 respectively. The purpose of a partnership for Loughborough as a whole would be to discuss issues such as the amount of parking, quality of parking, and payment

methods. Suitable organisations to be included in the partnership include CBC, private car park operators, Police, traders, cycle user groups, motorcycle user groups, and other stakeholders.

- 6.18.2. **It is also recommended that CBC should seek to work closely with the private car park operators and nearby local authorities to develop a co-ordinated and consistent approach to car parking** and minimise the potential for negative competition i.e. an un-coordinated tariff structure encourages vehicles to travel further to park where charges are lower.

6.19. Business Plan

- 6.19.1. Revenue generated from parking currently goes towards the Borough Council's general budget and is therefore used to fund a variety of services throughout the borough (including parking and general transport improvements). The recommendations made with regard to car park improvements will require funding to be made available. It is estimated that additional income will be approximately £101,400 per year with a reduction in income of £29,660 per year resulting in a net increase of £71,740 per year. **Recommendation: capital funding is made available to facilitate the necessary car park improvements. It is suggested that 10% of the revenue generated by parking is 'ring-fenced' for parking improvements.** Taking into consideration the estimated increase in income of £71,740 per year, this would provide (using 2004 / 2005 figures) a budget of approximately £32,200 a year for car park improvements. The cost of new infrastructure and equipment is estimated to be approximately £395,350. It is important to note that the estimated £198,000 required to introduce an improved signing strategy could be funded as part of the Local Transport Plan, and in part by the private car park operators. Developer contributions could also be used to improve/enhance public car parking in lieu of provision of specific parking for the development.
- 6.19.2. It is considered that, as the proposed programme of improvements is implemented, the funding required for continued maintenance of the car parks should reduce and because of the opportunity for funding from sources other than CBC (paragraph 6.19.1) the 10% figure mentioned in paragraph 6.19.1 could be revised. Assuming that improvements to signing are provided as part of the LTP process and by the private car park operators, the remaining Capital required (£197,350) could be gained over the next 5 to 6 years if 10% of revenue generated by parking is ring fenced for parking improvements.
- 6.19.3. In terms of enforcement of parking control, the premise of CPE is that the operation will be 'self-funding' with income from penalty charge notices covering expenditure costs. With regard to any future revenue generated from CPE it is envisaged that LCC will retain any revenue generated from on-street enforcement, with revenue from off-street enforcement going to the relevant district/borough council. It should be noted though that discussions with LCC have revealed that

they do not expect CPE to generate any revenue for a number of years (due to high initial set up costs) and the actual level of any revenue is expected to be fairly low.

6.20. Monitoring Framework

6.20.1. CBC have been compiling car park data in the town centre for a number of years and **it is recommended that this is continued. It is also recommended that discussions are held with the privately operated public car park managers with a view to obtaining similar data for these car parks. This data should form part of an Annual Parking Strategy Progress Report (APSPR).**

6.20.2. The APSPR should include for an assessment of the income/expenditure for the public car parks and revenue generated. The report should identify the funding required for the proposed car park improvements in the coming year and whether there are sufficient funds to carry out the improvements identified. Similarly, the report should include a best value review of each individual car park in terms of usage/income/expenditure per parking space to establish performance indicators for each car park. The report should include a full statement of accounts and also make recommendations on the proposed tariff structure for the following year.

6.20.3. The APSPR should include for a review of the disabled, cycle and motorcycle parking provision within the town centre and recommendations for the following year.

6.21. Marketing and Promotion

6.21.1. **Recommendation:- CBC take an active role in the marketing and promotion of alternative travel modes.** This could include for participation in initiatives such as 'Cycle to Work Week', car sharing initiatives or greater promotion of the environmental/health benefits of alternative travel modes.

6.21.2. In terms of parking, the council's website should be enhanced to provide a link to a location plan of the public car parks. This should also include the location of privately operated public car parks. Whilst the availability of public transport information in CBCs Southfield Offices is considered suitable, information relating to parking is unavailable. It is recommended that leaflets displaying car parking information are available in CBCs Southfield Road Offices and other public buildings.