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INTRODUCTION

In September 2016 the Cornwall Traffic Management Parking Policy statement was approved by Cabinet, which contained the high level policy for introducing new Residents Parking Zones (RPZ) in Cornwall. Due to the high level nature of the Policy Statement, the Transport Policy team in the Economic Growth and Development directorate of Cornwall Council; Cornwall Council’s Parking Services team and the Regulatory team from Cormac’s Engineering Design Group developed a comprehensive Policy Guidance document to set out in more detail how new RPZs could operate practically. This contained a number of changes compared to how existing RPZs currently operate in order to improve enforcement, reduce the amount of misuse, continue to ensure adequate control over the numbers of vehicles parking within RPZs and to ensure that overall the cost of implementing and operating the zones is covered by the income generated by selling permits.

Following a pre-consultation exercise where new RPZs were considered in eight towns across the county, a further statutory consultation was held on the provision of 20 new RPZs in Truro, St Ives and Wadebridge using the new Policy Guidance and terms and conditions (T&Cs). Eight new zones were approved for implementation – 6 in Truro and 2 in St Ives. These have now been installed and became operational on 29th April 2019.

It is Cornwall Council’s desire to operate all RPZs in Cornwall under the same Policy and T&Cs for fairness of all residents and to minimize confusion both for administering/enforcing the zones and for the residents/general public using the zones (particularly in Truro where adjacent zones could have different rules).

To that end, Cornwall Council commissioned Cormac Solutions to carry out a statutory consultation to change the Traffic Regulation Orders (which govern how the RPZs operate) for all existing zones to bring these into line with the new Policy Guidance and the new zones.

The consultation was carried out between 14th March and 5th April 2019. This report contains an overview of the consulted changes, statistics on the responses received and a summary of the comments made during the consultation. The Cornwall Councillors for the areas affected by the consultation were also approached for comments and these are summarised and presented in this report.

This report provides a summary of the comments made during the statutory consultation, highlighting areas for further discussion, along with a summary of Officer recommendations which will go forward to the Highway Authority, who ultimately approve the making of the TRO.
2 WHAT CHANGES ARE BEING PROPOSED?

There are 21 existing residents parking zones (RPZs) in Cornwall - 14 in Truro, 3 in Launceston, 3 in Kingsand and Cawsand and 1 in Portwrinkle. An overview of the existing T&Cs and the proposed changes are presented below.

- The annual cost of the first and second permit (where available) will change to £50 and £75 respectively to ensure that the operational costs for each zone are covered by the cost of the permits and are not subsidised by other funding.
  - Currently first permit prices vary between £25 and £55 and second permit prices vary between £32.50 and £68.75.

- Generally the numbers of permits available per property will be limited to 2 per household. However in zones TZ1, TZ2, TZ4, and TZ8, the number of permits available per property will be limited to 1 residents’ permit only to increase the chances of permit holders being able to park within the zone. This is because the number of permits purchased has exceeded the usual number Cornwall Council expect to sell which means there are many more permits in use than there are available parking spaces in those zones.
  - Currently most zones are already limited to 2 permits per household however zone TZ2 is limited to 1 per property, TZ6 and TZ7 are limited to 1 per eligible resident.

- Residents’ Permits will be vehicle specific and therefore not transferable to deal with suspected and potential issues with misuse, as well as to make enforcement of the zone more efficient by facilitating the use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) technology. A £10 admin fee will be applicable to changes to the vehicle registration number displayed on the permit.
  - Currently permits in most zones have no association to specific vehicles which has led to permits being misused. TZ6 can have two number plates printed on the permit.

- Visitor ticket numbers will be limited to 100 times the number of residents’ permits available per household within a zone to address suspected and potential misuse (i.e. if the zone allows 2 permits per property then the visitor tickets will be limited to 200 annually)
  - Currently there are no formal limits for visitor tickets.

- Blue Badge holders who reside within a zone will need to display a valid permit alongside their Blue Badge, which can be obtained free of charge. Non-resident Blue Badge holders will be limited to 3 hours in the RPZs.
  - Currently all blue badge holders can park with no time limit in the existing zones meaning resident blue badge holders do not need to display a residents permit. In some town centre zones, a significant number of residents’ spaces become occupied for prolonged periods of time by non-resident blue badge holders which cause parking issues in those zones.

- New Professional Carers and Informal Carers permits will be available, free of charge, to enable care to take place at a residence within the catchment area for a zone.
  - Currently this is likely to be accommodated by a resident using the transferable nature of the existing residents permit.
• A new Charitable Organisation permit will be available at an annual cost of £10 for registered charities operating from an eligible property within the catchment area for a zone.
  o There is no specific provision for Charities in the existing T&Cs.

• Businesses operating within the catchment area for a zone will be able to apply for one of two types of permits. Type 1 will have an annual cost of £100 and will be vehicle specific to one number plate. Type 2 will have an annual cost of £150 and will be specific to three number plates (but can only be used in one vehicle at a time).
  o Currently the business permit is transferable to any vehicle.

• Care Homes can apply for a permit on behalf of its residents who live in an eligible property within a zone for the use of the residents of the home and/or their visitors.
  o Currently there is no specific provision for Care Homes in the existing T&Cs.

• Guest Houses/B&Bs/Hotels may apply for a variety of permits depending on their situation, outlined in the table below.
  o Currently there is no specific provision for Guest Houses in the existing T&Cs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of permits available per household in the zone:</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options for Hotels and Guest Houses/B&amp;Bs in the zone (Choose one option):</td>
<td>a. 1 residents’ permits (for an eligible resident) plus a maximum of 100 visitor permits</td>
<td>a. 2 residents’ permits (for eligible residents) plus a maximum of 200 visitor permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. A maximum of 300 visitor permits</td>
<td>b. 1 residents’ permit plus a maximum of 400 visitor permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. A maximum of 600 visitor permits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 WHAT DID RESIDENTS TELL US?

These changes were formally consulted on following the statutory procedure for introducing a new Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). As such, a notice was published in newspapers covering the areas where existing RPZs operate, the proposals were published on Cornwall Councils online consultation finder webpage and every property within the catchment areas of the zones were written to with details of the changes.

Whilst anyone is able to make representations in support of, or objecting to a TRO, residents were specifically asked to outline the impacts of the proposed changes on them as it was hoped this would generate more useful information on the effects of the changes.

All of the responses received were inputted into a database and the comments relating to the individual changes listed above were separated to enable analysis of these change by change.

An overall summary of the key impacts identified are presented below, along with additional commentary where necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. of Addresses within residents’ parking zones</th>
<th>3288</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of responses received</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key comments/impacts identified relating to the change in cost of the residents permits

- Some residents that currently pay £55 for their first permit welcomed the price reduction, and some residents who will see their costs increase still felt the scheme provided value for money.

- Many residents felt that insufficient justification has been provided regarding the increase in cost, however not all provided information about the impact of this.

- Retired residents on fixed incomes, or those on low wages, will struggle to find the additional costs, particularly on top of recent Council Tax increases.

- Residents did not understand why, or find it fair, that the second permit costs more than the first. Whilst part of the justification is to encourage alternative modes of transport, many felt the financial sum is not significant enough to actually create that change and therefore it is unfair charging people different prices for the same service.

- Many residents felt that the cost increase was a big increase in one go and ask for the increase to be phased in.

- Some residents suggested that this cost increase would encourage more people to convert their gardens to driveways, however due to the costs involved in doing this, it is unlikely that cost alone would be a main driving factor to doing this.

Key comments/impacts identified relating to making permits vehicle specific

- Residents in support of this change agreed that it will prevent misuse of the scheme, such as passing on permits to non-residents, or holiday let businesses using their permit for guests.
• Residents, particularly those who are retired or have young families, will find it more difficult and expensive to have visitors during the day as they are currently transferring their residents’ permit into visitor’s vehicles. This may lead to increased social isolation and reduced wellbeing of certain groups of people (particularly those who will not have access to an Informal Carers permit).

• Residents with a number of vehicles registered to their address will no longer have the flexibility to choose which of their vehicles are parked in the zone. This may lead to increased vehicle movements (shuffling cars around in off-road parking spaces), further increase in cost to the residents either in admin fees for changing the permit or in daily visitor tickets, and additional cars parked on the road because some people may feel that if they need to buy two permits, they would like to get full use out of them.

• Residents who share vehicle ownership with (but are not the registered keeper), or borrow a vehicle from, someone living outside of a zone, or who use hire cars regularly instead of owning a personal vehicle will no longer be able to use the residents permits, potentially encouraging higher levels of personal vehicle ownership. Whilst this situation can be accommodated with visitor tickets, this may cause issues depending on other household demands on the visitor tickets and the limits within that zone.

• Residents who use hire cars, company cars or work vehicles that change regularly and unpredictably will not be able to use a residents’ permit. This may have a significant impact either financially if it is possible to sufficiently accommodate the number of occasions with visitor tickets, or more fundamentally if the visitor ticket limits and other household demands on the visitor tickets would not allow this as a solution (the limits in part are set to ensure the visitor tickets are used by visitors and not as an additional full time permit). A significant number of people raised concerns about the impact of this change when using courtesy cars, however for short term needs, such as regular annual maintenance of vehicles, this can be accommodated by visitor tickets.

• Some residents suggested that this change would encourage more people to convert their gardens to driveways.

**Key comments/impacts identified relating to the £10 admin fee to change vehicle registration on permit**

• Many residents felt this level of extra cost was excessive and unjustified, especially on top of the price increase proposed.

• Some residents felt that at least one vehicle change should be allowed per year for free.

**Key comments/impacts identified relating to limiting visitor tickets**

• Some residents welcomed visitor ticket limits as they believe this will help to reduce permits being sold on or misused.

• Some residents in some zones felt that the limits were too generous and would not stop some permits being sold on or misused.

• Residents who are retired or have young families are more likely to have visitors during the operational hours of the zone and therefore some residents feel that limiting the number available per household is discriminatory against these groups of people.

• Some residents believe they will have to limit the number of visitors they have, particularly with the vehicle specific residents’ permits.
If building work is to be accommodated by visitor tickets then the limits may not be sufficient.
Some residents have questioned the efficiency of the new scheme, believing it will cost much more to administer than the current scheme, particularly if many more visitor tickets are being used then before, given the loss of transferable permits.

**Key comments/impacts identified relating to Blue Badge holder changes**
- Generally residents welcomed limiting non-resident blue badge holders to 3 hour
- Some residents raised concerns that 3 hours would not be sufficient for when disabled friends and family come to visit, however visitor tickets could be utilised in this case.

**Key comments/impacts identified relating to Professional and Informal carers permits**
- The addition of these permits were largely supported by residents, however some residents raised concerns that they could be misused.

**Key comments/impacts identified relating to business permits (not available in TZ2)**
- Some businesses raised concerns about the permits becoming vehicle specific, although this was largely because different staff use the permit, or Holiday Letting businesses use the permit for guests, rather than causing issues when the permit is being used for an essential business vehicle.
- Some residents felt that it was unfair that the cost of this permit type was not increased by a similar factor as the residents’ permits.

**In addition to these general changes, there were changes proposed regarding the number of permits available per household in some Truro zones.**

**In TZ1, TZ4 and TZ8 it was proposed to reduce the permit allocation from 2 per household to 1 per household. The following comments were made in these zones.**
- Those in support of this change agreed that this would reduce congestion and improve chances of finding a parking space in the zone.
- Residents who need more than one car will either struggle to run two vehicles as one would have to be parked very far away (in the nearest unrestricted area) or would have the significant additional financial cost of buying a season ticket for the car parks.
- Residents would rather additional spaces are created instead of limiting availability. Some comments have been made about allowing residents to use the car parks. Whilst these are already free overnight, consideration could be given to allowing permit holders use of the car parks during the day.

**In TZ6 and TZ7 it was proposed that the allocation is changed from 1 per eligible resident to 2 per household. The following comments were made in these zones.**
- Residents with adult children living at home that also need vehicles would struggle with this change.
- A number of responses from zone TZ7 were concerned about the impact of this change on shared households, where a number of young professional who need vehicles for employment would struggle if only two, vehicle specific permits were allowed. Many felt that there is sufficient on road parking to allow more than two permits per household.
In Launceston, at the request of the Councillor, residents were asked what the impact would be of removing the zone, compared to the proposed changes. The following comments were made.

- Residents would struggle to park near their homes and would go back to competing with commuters for on-street parking spaces if the zone was removed. There was no support for this option.

Additionally in Launceston, it was proposed that permits for zone LA1 were also valid in Cattle Market Carpark during the day. The following comments were made:

- Some residents welcomed the addition of the car park under the permit scheme, however some residents said this would not be well utilised due to the distance from their property and concerns over security of their vehicles, particularly if parked here over night.

There were no specific comments relating to the charity permit; however one charity operating within one of the zones made a comment that they would struggle to operate with a vehicle specific permit as different staff stay at the property overnight, using the existing transferable permit in different cars depending who is on duty.

There were no specific comments relating to the permits available to residents of a care home, but comments were received from a care home operating within a zone regarding some of the other changes. They currently use a non-vehicle specific business permit for visiting health care professionals. As the proposed business permits will be vehicle specific (either to 1 number plate or 3), they will no longer be able to use this permit for this purpose and so it will be of no use. They also do not feel that a limit of 200 visitor permits will be sufficient to accommodate all of the visitors that the residents of the care home receive (as many are admitted in emergency situations or are not there long enough to apply for a residents’ permit), however as each resident within the care home will be eligible for a transferable permit, the Policy Guidance does not currently facilitate visitor tickets for care homes.

No comments were received regarding the provisions for Guest Houses/B&Bs/Hotels.

Other comments made, not relating to the changes proposals were:

- There is a perceived lack of enforcement presence in some zones;
- There is a perceived lack of maintenance in some zones (e.g. faded bay markings);
- Operation hours should be reconsidered (some extended, some reduced);
- It’s not fair that visitor tickets expire and that there is no refund for unused tickets;
- It should be easier to apply for and renew permits online

Telephone responses

A number of telephone calls were received during the consultation period in which people expressed concerns with some of the proposals and outlined the impacts on them. However it is evident that not all of these calls were followed up with a written response as required. That being said, these phone calls only serve to highlight themes commonly raised by the written respondents.

Responses from statutory consultees

Truro City Council made the following response:
“(i) Members did not approve of the significant and disproportionate price increase of the parking permit charges, and felt there should be a transition period where this is phased in;

(ii) There had been insufficient notification of the consultation, therefore not allowing for due consideration to an important issue. Members commented that if preparations were already underway prior to Cornwall Council receiving consultation responses then it was not a consultation at all;

(ii) Members did not feel individual vehicle registration numbers should be linked to permits as this could still allow for secondary sales. Instead, it was suggested that addresses of permit holders could be linked to each permit via a database (perhaps identified via a barcode system). This would allow for Cornwall Council to easily identify which dwelling had which permit(s).”

No other town or parish councils responded to the consultation.

No response was received from the Police.
4 WHAT DID THE COUNCILLORS SAY?

After the consultation, the initial analysis of the response was discussed with the local Councillors, with particular focus on the issues raised in their divisions. They made the following comments:

Cllr George Trubody (Kingsand, Cawsand and Portwrinkle)

Cllr Trubody is in support of the changes and would like to see them implemented as proposed.

In relation to comments made by second home and holiday let owners and the difficulties they will face with the proposals, Cllr Trubody said that the businesses still need to be able to operate as a business and that parking forms part of this, however the original intention of the residents parking scheme is to improve the parking situation for residents, and therefore holiday let business operating in the area will need to utilise other options available such as the car parks.

Cllr David Harris (Truro)

In relation to comments made about the level of the cost increase, and the difficulties it may cause for residents who are pensioners on fixed incomes, Cllr Harris has said that he would welcome the cost increase being phased in (over 3 years, for example) rather than being implemented all at once.

In relation to comments made about the permits becoming vehicle specific, in particular comments made about residents loss of flexibility to choose which of their vehicles they park on the road, Cllr Harris has said that he would welcome a change in the scheme that allowed more than one vehicle to be registered to each permit, as is currently possible in zone TZ6. It was explained that a difficulty in this comes when trying to enforce the zones with ANPR as it would not be possible to tell through the system if both of the vehicles are parked on the road at once (both vehicles would register as having valid permits).

Cllr Bert Biscoe (Truro)

In relation to comments made regarding the reduction of permit availability from 2 permits to 1 permit, Cllr Biscoe felt that the zones need to be operationally workable and so if there are many more vehicles trying to park within a zone than there are spaces to park in, this should be addressed.

In relation to comments made regarding the level of cost increase, Cllr Biscoe said that it is important to be transparent about how the cost have been worked out. He also felt that there was little justification for charging more for the second permit. He agrees that people need to be encouraged to cut fossil fuel use, but using financial penalties to engineer this is not appropriate. Cllr Biscoe feels that both permits should be priced at £50.

In relation to the £10 fee applicable for changing the number plate on the permit, Cllr Biscoe said this should reflect the actual cost in administering the change and vary as needed (i.e. reducing the cost if this can be handled online).

In relation to visitor permit limits, Cllr Biscoe said that this is likely to impact vulnerable people who rely on a support network, therefore this element needs to be handled with caution.

Cllr Dulcie Tudor (Truro)

In relation to the potential reduction in numbers of permits available per household in zone TZ7, Cllr Tudor was concerned about how this will impact shared properties as there may not be any
alternatives if the properties do not have sufficient off-road parking. Cllr Tudor had some concerns about the impact this change would have on landlords being able to let their properties as shared houses.

In relation to comments made about the additional costs for the second permit, Cllr Tudor said that Cornwall Council need to be open about why this price has been set and does not feel that this change will sufficiently encourage alternative forms of transport.

**Cllr Rob Nolan (Truro)**

In relation to comment made regarding the level of cost increase, Cllr Nolan said that he would like to see the cost increase phased in, if possible, but it is fair that every zone pays the same.

Cllr Nolan did not feel that the justification for charging more for the second permit was sound and felt this was hard to rationalise when talking to residents. He would like both permits to cost £50 each.

In relation to comments made regarding vehicle specific permits Cllr Nolan felt that this change was making the scheme worse and has the potential to cause significant inconvenience for residents. He felt that the residents parking schemes were designed to make like easier for people by removing competition from commuters, which they have done, but this change in particular was putting unnecessary restrictions on residents’ freedoms. Whilst Cllr Nolan would prefer residents’ permits to remain transferable, as a minimum, he would like to keep the second permit transferable, although it was explained that this would be penalising residents with no vehicles as they would not be able to obtain the first permit if they have no vehicle to register it to.

Finally, in relation to visitor ticket limits, Cllr Nolan did not think it was right for the council to effectively be limiting the numbers of visitors people could have.

**Cllr Loic Rich (Truro)**

In relation to comments made regarding the unfairness of differential cost for the first and second permits, Cllr Rich did not think the argument for implementing this was sufficient and that encouraging people to use alternative forms of transport should not be done through financially penalising people who happen to live in certain streets.

Cllr Rich also felt that charging an administration fee on top of the increased permit price to change the vehicle registration number was not fair.

**Cllr Jade Farrington (Launceston)**

In relation to comments made regarding the level of cost increase, Cllr Farrington did not feel this had been adequately justified, and felt that charging more for the second permit would be penalising working people who have no choice but to run more than one vehicle.

Cllr Farrington would prefer residents’ permits to remain transferable and for both first and second permits to cost the same.

**Cllr Gemma Massey (Launceston)**

No comments received
5 DISCUSSION

The most significant concern is regarding the low response rate to the consultation. Letters were sent to every property within the catchment areas for the zones but it is possible that recipients either did not appreciate the importance of the correspondence (i.e. some may have assumed it was a generic council circular or similar). Likewise the volume of information included within the letter may have put people off taking the time to understand the content. Whilst it is believed that adequate measures have been taken to inform all relevant stakeholders about the statutory consultation, Cornwall Council should be aware that there may be a negative reaction to the changes, should they be made, if people feel they were not adequately consulted with.

Furthermore, whilst the response rate was relatively low, the comments made by residents on how the proposals will impact them are also likely to apply to others who have not responded. Therefore the focus should not be put on how many people made a particular comment, but instead on a response to those comments either addressing the issues, clarifying why the changes are necessary or offering ways of mitigating the impact. A summary of the key consideration are presented below, along with a response/commentary from officers in *italics*.

**Changes to cost**

- Is there a way of managing the financial impact on low income households?
  - *Officers have indicated that they hope the permit system will be managed electronically soon and it may potentially be possible to allow residents to purchase permits for different timescales (i.e. quarterly instead of annually), effectively spreading the cost of the permits.*
- Should the proposed changes proceed, further justification of the permit costs should be provided.
  - *Further justification of the costs can be provided when writing back to residents.*
- Based on member feedback, consideration should be given to costing the first and second permit at the same level.
  - *Officers have indicated that in addition to encouraging other forms of transport, the additional cost for the second permit is contributing to the residents parking zones being able to cover their own costs, therefore changing this would result in budget pressures on the Parking Service.*

**Vehicle Specific Permit**

- Overall, are the benefits of this change in terms of scheme operation, enforcement and reducing misuse, worth the inconvenience and additional financial cost (in visitor tickets, for example) to many households, as well as the particular impact this change will have on retired residents or those with young families?
  - *Officers have said that the changes being proposed will have a big impact on their ability to effectively manage and enforce the residents parking zones. Conversely, if the changes are not made then there will be additional difficulties for the Parking Service due to there being different schemes in operation, some in very close proximity to one another. This will create confusion for both residents, visitors and enforcement, potentially resulting in greater resources needed from Cornwall Council to communicate and resolve issues, or in the worst case, making some schemes unenforceable.*
- Is there a way of managing this change to allow multiple vehicles, registered at a property, to be valid to one permit to maintain choice and flexibility for residents?
o Officers have said that this change would not allow for electronic permits and enforcement to take place using ANPR. It is believed that more efficiencies can be realised by utilising both of these technologies, meaning that further permit cost increases are less likely as cost of operating the scheme can be kept to a minimum.

- Is there a way of managing this change to facilitate those who need to use company cars or work vehicles that change regularly and unpredictably?
  o Officers have indicated that arrangements could be made for special cases where other options are not workable, however this will be judged on a case by case basis and the resident would need to contact the permit team to discuss their individual circumstances.

£10 admin fee for changing vehicle registration on permit

- Could a set number of changes per year be accommodated in the cost of the permit?
  o Officers have said that there is currently a cost to verify the new vehicle details, print and re-issue a permit, therefore to include any number of changes in the permit price would result in an increased permit price for the scheme to cover its costs. If the permit schemes can be managed electronically then the costs can be reviewed and reduced as only a manual check of the vehicle details will be required.

Visitor ticket limits

- Overall, are the benefits of limiting visitor tickets worth the potential impact on certain groups of vulnerable people?
  o Officers have said that limits are required in the first instance in order of effectively manage the numbers of vehicles parking in the zone and to reduce permit misuse, however limits can be reviewed and revised based on feedback from local members, permit uptake and zone capacity.

Reduction in the number of permits available per household (In TZ1, TZ4, TZ8)

- Can consideration be given to creating more parking spaces in the zone, either by removing existing restrictions or by allowing use of the car parks during the day?
  o Any changes to on-street restrictions will require a change in the TRO and therefore officers have said that any potential areas that are identified as being suitable for a residents’ parking restriction should be nominated by the local member to be considered within the Community Network Panel TRO schemes.
  o Officers have said that in Truro, it is not possible to allow use of residents’ permits in the car parks due to there being insufficient capacity during the day.

Potential reduction in the number of permits available per household (In TZ6 and TZ7)

- Is it necessary to limit the number of permits in these zones to 2 per household, given the availability of parking spaces?
  o Officers have said that limits are required in the first instance in order of effectively manage the numbers of vehicles parking in the zone and to reduce permit misuse, however limits can be reviewed and revised based on feedback from local members, permit uptake and zone capacity.

Launceston
Can consideration be given to creating additional spaces in these zones by removing existing restrictions?
  - Any changes to on-street restrictions will require a change in the TRO and therefore officers have said that any potential areas that are identified as being suitable for a residents’ parking restriction should be nominated by the local member to be considered within the Community Network Panel TRO schemes.

Kingsand/Cawsand

- Generally the residents and the Councillor supported the proposed changes. If any changes are made to the T&C’s in light of this report, could consideration be given to implementing the changes as proposed in Kingsand and Cawsand?
  - Officers have indicated that they would like all changes to be implemented as proposed, but should changes be made to address particular issues raised, it is likely that the Kingsand/Cawsand zones could still have the changes as proposed as there are already zones with these T&C’s in operation.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Further to discussions with the local Councillors and Cornwall Council Officers, the following recommendations are being put forward for consideration by the Highway Authority:

- Residents’ permit allocations should be set at two per household for all residents parking zones, except TZ2 which should remain at 1 permit per household. Permit allocations for TZ1, TZ4 and TZ8 should not be reduced.
- The residents’ parking restrictions in Launceston should not be removed.
- All other changes should be implemented as proposed in order to ensure the costs of running the residents’ parking schemes are not being subsidised by tax payers, as well as to ensure effective and efficient operation and enforcement of the zones can take place and issues of permit misuse are addressed.