

Review of Parking Issues



CONTENT

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Foreword | 3 |
| Executive Summary and Recommendations | 4 |
| Section 1: Introduction | 7 |
| Section 2: Terms of Reference and Working Group | 8 |
| Section 3: How the Review Was Carried Out | 9 |
| Section 4: Parking Matters | 11 |
| Section 5: Key Findings and Recommendations | 29 |
| Background Papers | 32 |
| Appendix One: Results of Region-wide and Tweeddale Surveys on Parking | |
| Appendix Two: Results of Survey on Kelso Parking | |

Foreword from the Chairman of the Working Group

A great deal has been spoken and written about parking in town centres and elsewhere in the Scottish Borders, from the abuse of traffic restrictions, to the demise of the Traffic Warden service and the seeming lack of monitoring or enforcement. Parking in town centres is vital in ensuring people can access the goods and services they need, playing an important part in the Borders economy, and also has a crucial role to play in managing traffic and congestion. In the course of this review, we have examined the extent of parking restrictions and availability in Border towns, the position on enforcement including the potential for decriminalised parking enforcement, and options for the future. This examination has allowed us to take account of many different views and also provided us with an insight into wider parking behaviours in the Borders.

Much analysis has been carried out by the Working Group to arrive at its conclusions and I thank the members and officers for their time and energy, commending the findings and recommendations to you.

Councillor Gordon Edgar
Chairman, Parking Issues Working Group



14 February 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY and RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) Scottish Borders Council has considered various aspects associated with parking on a number of occasions since 2002. The arrangements for the setting up of a Working Group to examine innovative solutions to the parking problems in the Scottish Borders were agreed at the Executive Committee meeting on 7 November 2017.
- b) The Working Group comprised seven Councillors, namely:
- Councillor Gordon Edgar (Chairman), Selkirkshire
 - Councillor Andy Anderson, Galashiels & District
 - Councillor Carol Hamilton, East Berwickshire
 - Councillor Euan Jardine, Galashiels & District
 - Councillor Clair Ramage, Hawick & Denholm
 - Councillor Euan Robson, Kelso & District
 - Councillor Robin Tatler, Tweeddale East
- c) Final terms of reference for the Group were approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting on 17 April 2018. The objective of the Review was to ensure the Council maximises parking opportunities in Border towns, ensuring sufficient turnover within town centres to bring economic benefits to the businesses located there, and, where parking restrictions are in place, that these are clearly marked and enforceable. The scope of the Review covered:
- *The extent of parking availability in Border towns*
 - *The extent of parking restrictions in Border towns and Traffic Regulation Orders – content and spread*
 - *The Police position*
 - *Reported parking problems and issues: specific places, times and days for/by businesses, visitors and residents*
 - *The legal position for parking restrictions and enforcement*
 - *Other Councils' solutions*
 - *Options for parking including potential additional spaces, restrictions, control and enforcement*
 - *Fully costed options for any recommendations*
- d) Throughout its Review, the Working Group requested and received further information and explanation on particular aspects of parking, namely:
- Decriminalised Parking Enforcement
 - Parking restrictions across the Borders including Traffic Regulation Orders
 - Enforcement of parking regulations and complaints/issues
 - Community Action Team
 - Feedback from Elected Members
 - Survey feedback from members of the public

- e) Parking issues are not unique to the Scottish Borders and attract much comment. In arriving at their findings and recommendations, Members of the Working Group have concluded that much of the comment made and received is based on perception or anecdotal evidence and the details provided to Members demonstrated that the number of parking spaces available is sufficient for most days in most towns. Off street car parks are often not used to their full extent if they are not in the immediate vicinity of people's work or where they wish to shop. While many of the comments received in the surveys raised issues, there were very few ideas put forward as to how these could be resolved. The need for more parking places was highlighted but historic town layouts mean finding effective and viable additional space is rarely possible.
- f) Enforcement of parking and waiting restrictions is seen as a continuing issue. The misconception still remains that it was the Council which had employed and then removed the Traffic Warden service, rather than Police Scotland. The Council investment in the Police Community Action Team may go some way to assisting with enforcement but as the Team has only been in place since April 2018 it is too early to accurately determine its effectiveness on parking behaviours. Cost will also need to be included as a determining factor in any future enforcement regime. The Working Group is therefore making 6 recommendations.

Recommendation One

- g) A review of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) should be carried out to simplify and amalgamate these and produce one TRO for the whole of the Borders covering all towns. This review should include changes to waiting times so that all Border towns have standard restricted waiting periods of 1 and/or 2 hour periods, with a 1 hour return period; and such restrictions shall operate Monday to Saturday from 08:30 to 17:30, which will provide a greater degree of consistency across the Borders. In terms of waiting times, each Councillor should be asked what they would like to see within their towns – 1 hour restriction, 2 hour restriction or a combination.
[Estimated cost £205k in-house or £225k external]

Recommendation Two

- h) Directional signage to both long and short term for on and off-street parking should be reviewed to ensure that sufficient signage is in place to direct visitors to the most appropriate parking.
[Estimated cost = £28,500]

Recommendation Three

- i) Updating of single and double yellow and white line marking should continue as part of the planned ongoing programme across the Borders to ensure clarity on parking restrictions. A review of parking bays should also be carried out to ascertain whether any changes can be made e.g. from parallel to diagonal parking, to increase the number of spaces available, or whether

marking specific bays in on-street parking would also be of help. Specific marking to identify dropped kerbs may also be a benefit.
[Estimated cost = from £28,250 up to £278,250]

Recommendation Four

- j) A media campaign should be held as part of the Council's *#yourpart* initiative to encourage people to "park fair". This could include the impact of parking on pavements and next to dropped kerbs (hindrance to buggy and wheelchair users), in bus laybys (buses then block traffic), and overstaying time limited parking areas (impacts on the economic viability of town centres if there is insufficient turnover). Flouting restrictions shows a lack of respect for other drivers and users of town centres, both local and visitors. Information should also be included on the Council's website on the location, duration and cost of parking in each of the main towns.
[Estimated cost = £10,000]

Recommendation Five

- k) Full costs in the consideration of potential different enforcement regimes – including timescales for development and implementation - should be developed (e.g. existing regime including use of the Police Community Action Team, or Decriminalised Parking Enforcement, etc.) with any options considered as part of the Council's future budget planning process.
[Estimated cost = from £20,000 to £327,900]

Recommendation Six

- l) In order to help future-proof parking in town centres, at one point during the remaining term of this Council, a feasibility study should be carried out on one or two town centres to take account of the potential impact of future housing and other developments over a 10 year period. This will help ascertain what other infrastructure could be put in place in Borders' historic town centres to decrease congestion and provide the Council with a longer term parking management policy.
[Estimated cost = £35,000]
- m) Should all recommendations be accepted, then Council would need to consider finding between £326,750 and £904,650 of additional funding within its future years' budgets. Some of these costs may be split over a number of years. Given the amount of additional funding required (should all these recommendations be accepted) Area Partnerships could be consulted to identify where parking issues sit in terms of priority for spend within each particular locality.

Section 1: INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Scottish Borders Council has considered various aspects associated with parking on a number of occasions since 2002.
- 1.2 A report to the Executive on 17 December 2002 gave details of 'before' and 'after' surveys of on-street parking with the introduction of Pay and Display charges in car parks in Kelso, Selkirk, Peebles, Eyemouth, Galashiels and Hawick. On 25 March 2008, the Executive approved a Parking Strategy for the Scottish Borders. The objective of this Strategy was to provide measures to develop a consistent parking framework across the Council area.
- 1.3 Council further considered a report on 12 December 2013 on the proposed withdrawal of the Traffic Warden Service by Police Scotland. This was followed up with a further report to the Environment and Infrastructure Committee on 20 March 2014 on the withdrawal of the Traffic Warden Service and set up a Working Group to consider the options available to the Council in relation to the future control of on-street parking.
- 1.4 On 29 June 2016, Council considered an update report from the Working Group, agreeing that parking studies be carried out in the key town centres of Duns, Eyemouth, Galashiels, Hawick, Jedburgh, Kelso, Innerleithen, Lauder, Melrose, Peebles, Selkirk and West Linton. At the Council meeting held on 10 November 2016, Members considered a report providing an update in relation to on-street parking and in particular the findings of town centre parking surveys. At that meeting, Members decided to pilot a disc-based parking system in partnership with Police Scotland. However, as reported to the Council meeting on 23 February 2017, Police Scotland subsequently advised that they could not enforce such a system so this was not taken forward.
- 1.5 As part of the debate on the Administration's vision "Connected Borders 2017 – 2022" at the Council meeting on 28 September 2017, the re-establishment of a Parking Working Group was agreed and the details were confirmed at the meeting of the Executive Committee on 7 November 2017.

Section 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE and WORKING GROUP

- 2.1 The Working Group comprised seven Councillors, namely:
- Councillor Gordon Edgar (Chairman), Selkirkshire
 - Councillor Andy Anderson, Galashiels & District
 - Councillor Carol Hamilton, East Berwickshire
 - Councillor Euan Jardine, Galashiels & District
 - Councillor Clair Ramage, Hawick & Denholm
 - Councillor Euan Robson, Kelso & District
 - Councillor Robin Tatler, Tweeddale East
- 2.2 Support was provided to the Working Group by the Service Director Assets & Infrastructure, the Chief Officer – Roads, the Network Manager, the Team Leader – Road Safety & Traffic Management, the Research and Policy Officer, and the Clerk to the Council.
- 2.3 The Terms of Reference for the Working Group were:

Objective – to ensure the Council maximizes parking opportunities in Border towns, ensuring sufficient turnover within town centres to bring economic benefits to the businesses located there, and, where parking restrictions are in place, that these are clearly marked and enforceable.

Scope –

1. The extent of parking availability in Border towns.
2. The extent of parking restrictions in Border towns and Traffic Regulation Orders – content and spread.
3. The Police position.
4. Reported parking problems and issues: specific places, times and days for/by businesses, visitors and residents.
5. The legal position for parking restrictions and enforcement.
6. Other Councils' solutions.
7. Options for parking including potential additional spaces, restrictions, control and enforcement.
8. Fully costed options for any recommendations.

Section 3: HOW THE REVIEW WAS CARRIED OUT

- 3.1 The Working Group met on 7 occasions – 10 January, 30 March, 17 May, 4 July, 17 September, 8 November 2018 and 7 February 2019.
- 3.2 At its first meeting, the Group received a presentation from Officers on Decriminalised Parking Enforcement, the current position in the Borders in terms of the Parking Strategy, the use of Traffic Regulation Orders, and enforcement of parking by Police Scotland. The role and remit of the Group was also considered.
- 3.3 At the second meeting of the Working Group, members confirmed the role and remit of the Group. Members also considered limited waiting times and the differences between towns; the pressures on parking within towns; complaints about parking; and enforcement of parking regulations. It was agreed that a drop-in session would be held for other Elected Members to provide evidence of areas of problem parking within towns in their own Wards. This session was held on 26 April 2018.
- 3.4 At the third meeting of the Working Group, Members received further details on the work of the Police Community Action Team, which included problematic parking within its remit. Councillor Tatler had initiated an on-line survey in Tweeddale comprising 9 questions about parking, and the Group agreed to replicate this across the other localities in the Borders. The Group also considered standardization of waiting times in towns, shared services with other Authorities, and parking controls/enforcement in other rural Authorities.
- 3.5 At the fourth meeting of the Working Group, Members received the interim results of the parking survey across the Borders which had closed a few days beforehand.
- 3.6 At the fifth meeting of the Working Group, Members considered a first draft of the report of the Working Group which gave details of the Terms of Reference of the Working Group, how the review was carried out, what had been covered, along with draft findings and recommendations. The Working Group made minor amendments to the Report and added in a sixth recommendation. Officers then carried out further work to estimate the costs associated with each of the recommendations.
- 3.7 At the sixth meeting of the Working Group, Members considered a second draft of the report, made an amendment to Recommendation One and minor amendments to the remainder of the report. This amended Report was then considered by the Council's Corporate Management Team.

- 3.8 At the seventh meeting of the Working Group, Members considered the Officer covering report with proposed recommendations from the Council's Corporate Management Team for consideration by the Executive Committee.

Section 4: PARKING MATTERS

4.1 The Scottish Borders covers some 4,732 square kilometres (1,827 square miles) and is predominantly rural in nature, with the largest town being Hawick. Within the 5 localities of the region, the population of the main towns in 2014 and average weekly footfall in town centres in 2015 (figures from Scottish Borders Strategic Assessment, 2016), were as follows:

- Berwickshire: Eyemouth (population – 3,540; footfall – 2,270) and Duns (population – 2,722; footfall – 1,630)
- Cheviot: Kelso (population 6,821; footfall – 5,550) and Jedburgh (population – 3,961; footfall – 2,460)
- Eildon: Galashiels (population – 12,670; footfall – 8,180), Selkirk (population – 5,586; footfall – 2,350) and Melrose (population 2,457; footfall – 3,550)
- Teviot & Liddesdale: Hawick (population – 14,003; footfall – 4,360)
- Tweeddale: Peebles (population – 8,583; footfall – 7,930) and Innerleithen (population – 3,064)

It should be noted that some of this footfall will be from visitors/tourists and not just local residents.

Scope: The extent of parking availability in Border towns

4.2 There is a variety of parking available in Borders town centres, with a mix of on-street and off-street, some short stay and some long stay. On-street parking is free and some off-street car parks have pay and display charges. All of the parking detailed in the table below is within a 5 minute walk of the main town centre. If drivers comply with the restrictions in place then there is in general no capacity issue. The main towns of Hawick, Galashiels and Peebles have a number of car parks attached to supermarkets or retail parks close to the town centres where parking is available for up to 3 hours. It should be noted that these spaces are not included in the table below. The capacity of each town centre in terms of parking spaces is as follows:

| TOWN | ON-STREET PARKING | | | | OFF-STREET PARKING | | | TOTAL |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| | Limited Waiting | Unlimited Waiting | Disabled | On-street total | No. of spaces (Pay & Display) | Disabled (Pay & Display) | Off-street total | |
| Berwickshire | | | | | | | | |
| Duns | 235 | 20 | 5 | 260 | 77 | 5 | 82 | 342 |
| Eyemouth | 37 | 20 | 2 | 59 | 185 | 11 | 196 | 255 |

| Cheviot | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|---|------------|-----------|---------|------------|------------|
| Jedburgh | 63 | 15 | 0 | 78 | 293 | 6 | 299 | 377 |
| Kelso | 166 | 25 | 4 | 195 | 242 | 9 | 251 | 446 |
| Eildon | | | | | | | | |
| Galashiels | 171 | 10 | 0 | 181 | 278 (229) | 12 (12) | 290 | 471 |
| Lauder | 0 | 173 | 0 | 173 | 37 | 0 | 37 | 210 |
| Melrose | 66 | 45 | 1 | 112 | 133 (29) | 6 (1) | 139 | 251 |
| Selkirk | 61 | 20 | 2 | 83 | 122 | 2 | 124 | 207 |
| Teviot & Liddesdale | | | | | | | | |
| Hawick | 190 | 60 | 0 | 250 | 569 (83) | 19 (8) | 588 | 838 |
| Tweeddale | | | | | | | | |
| Innerleithen | 67 | 50 | 0 | 117 | 52 | 2 | 54 | 171 |
| Peebles | 104 | 35 | 3 | 142 | 314 (252) | 17 (14) | 331 | 473 |
| West Linton | 0 | 42 | 1 | 42 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 53 |

Scope: The extent of parking restrictions in Border towns and Traffic Regulation Orders – content and spread

- 4.3 The current on-street parking regime operates under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 with Police Scotland responsible for enforcement. This Act allows the Council to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to prohibit or restrict the waiting of vehicles or the loading and unloading of vehicles, either at all times or at times, on days or during periods so specified. Duties under the Disabled Persons Parking Places (Scotland) Act 2009 also require on-street and off-street TROs to be introduced and updated regularly for the allocation of specific disabled parking spaces.
- 4.4 With regard to restrictions on waiting times, the following are currently in operation:

Berwickshire

| TOWN | WAITING PERIOD | RETURN PERIOD | OPERATING PERIOD | OPERATING DAYS |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Coldstream | 1 hour | 2 hours | 09:00 – 18:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Duns | 2 hours | 1 hour | 09:00 – 18:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Eyemouth | 45 mins | 75 mins | 08:30 to 17:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Eyemouth (Home St) | 45 mins | 75 mins | 08:00 to 18:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |

Cheviot

| TOWN | WAITING PERIOD | RETURN PERIOD | OPERATING PERIOD | OPERATING DAYS |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Jedburgh | 45 mins | 75 mins | 08:30 to 17:30 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Jedburgh | 45 mins | 75 mins | 09:00 to 18:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Kelso (controlled zone) | 2 hours | 1 hour | 08:00 – 18:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |

Eildon

| TOWN | WAITING PERIOD | RETURN PERIOD | OPERATING PERIOD | OPERATING DAYS |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Galashiels | 1 hour | 1 hour | 08:30 to 17:30 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Galashiels | 2 hours | 1 hour | 08:30 to 17:30 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Melrose | 1 hour | 1 hour | 10:00 to 16:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Melrose | 1 hour | 1 hour | 09:00 – 17:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |
| Selkirk | 30 mins | 30 mins | 08:30 to 17:30 | Mondays to Saturdays |

Teviot & Liddesdale

| TOWN | WAITING PERIOD | RETURN PERIOD | OPERATING PERIOD | OPERATING DAYS |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Hawick | 30 mins | 30 mins | 08:30 to 17:30 | Mondays to Saturdays |

Tweeddale

| TOWN | WAITING PERIOD | RETURN PERIOD | OPERATING PERIOD | OPERATING DAYS |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Innerleithen | 45 mins | 75 mins | 08:30 to 18:00 | Mondays to Fridays |
| Innerleithen | 45 mins | 75 mins | 08:30 to 13:00 | Saturdays |
| Peebles | 45 mins | 75 mins | 08:30 to 18:00 | Mondays to Saturdays |

- 4.5 All the above waiting restrictions operate Mondays to Saturdays with the exception of Innerleithen, which operates Mondays to Fridays and a ½ day on Saturdays to 13:00. It should also be noted that there are variations in hours of operation within towns.

4.6 There are also a number of private car parks in operation across the Borders. These are mainly attached to major supermarkets (Galashiels, Hawick, Peebles) or retail parks with restrictions on parking either for customers only or for times ranging from 2 to 3 hours. Apart from a small scheme in Harbour Road, Eyemouth, introduced in conjunction with Eyemouth Harbour Trust, there are currently no parking charges for on-street parking in the Scottish Borders.

Scope: The Police Scotland position

4.7 The financial savings required by Police Scotland had resulted in a close examination of many areas of business to look at both efficiency and whether there was a need for the service to be continued. In June 2013, Police Scotland advised the Council that they were embarking on a review of the service delivered by traffic wardens. Enforcement of parking in Scotland had historically been delivered by traffic wardens employed by police forces. The relevant provisions of the Road Traffic Act 1991 enabled the decriminalisation of most non-endorsable parking offences in Scotland from June 1997. Since that time, a number of local authorities had adopted decriminalised parking enforcement. This was particularly attractive to urban or city authorities where decriminalised parking offered significant financial opportunities.

4.8 In October 2013, Police Scotland advised the Council that traffic wardens would be withdrawn from service from February 2014. At that time Police Scotland had 2.8FTE traffic wardens in the Scottish Borders. One covered the Galashiels, Melrose and the Peebles area. Another covered the Hawick, Selkirk, and Jedburgh area. The remaining 0.8FTE covered Duns, Eyemouth, Coldstream, Kelso and Earlston. In that year, 613 vehicle excise tickets and 1102 parking tickets were issued by Wardens. It should be noted that wardens operated on the basis of advising drivers of issues and moving them on where possible, and only issued tickets as a measure of last resort.

4.9 Although the traffic wardens were withdrawn in 2014, the responsibility for parking enforcement still lies with Police Scotland, whose focus is now on the core activity of keeping people safe. Where parking is dangerous or causes significant obstruction, Police Scotland will task police officers to resolve the issue using the appropriate enforcement activity, including parking tickets, other direct measures or prosecution reports. Police Scotland believes that parking enforcement would best be carried out by local authorities through a decriminalised parking enforcement regime.

4.10 In April 2018, Scottish Borders Council agreed to fund a police Community Action Team, comprising a Sergeant and 6 police officers, as an additional resource to the existing police presence in the Borders. The Team's remit is predominantly "quality of life" through dealing with anti-social issues to help deter crime and disorder through engagement and enforcement. The tasks carried out by the Team are based on previous incidents, current intelligence, and taking account of seasonal issues.

4.11 With regard to problematic parking, the enforcement of parking violations is carried out on an ad-hoc basis by local police officers. This is now supplemented by the Community Action Team whose officers have provided education to members of the public on parking restrictions, including engaging with local business owners, who on the whole have been very supportive. From April to December 2018, the Team has issued 632 parking enforcement notices and other police officers a further 324, giving a total of 956. In the same period in 2017, 506 notices were issued; this demonstrates an increase of 89%. Going forward, the Team will continue to carry out regular patrols in all Borders towns to combat dangerous parking; they will highlight to Council officers where single and double yellow lines are not clear and need replaced; and they will have problematic parking as a standing item in their remit. It is hoped that the more police officers are seen on the streets, the more the public will adhere to parking restrictions.

Scope: Reported parking problems and issues: specific places, times and days for/by businesses, visitors and residents.

4.12 In December 2002, the Executive considered a report giving the results of "before" and "after" surveys on the effects of on-street parking with following the introduction of Pay and Display controls in Eyemouth, Galashiels, Hawick, Kelso, Peebles, and Selkirk. These surveys were carried out at a time when the Traffic Warden service was in place. The study areas in the surveys were those considered likely to be affected by drivers parking on-street (in limited and unlimited waiting times areas) to avoid the new Pay and Display charges. The conclusion of the report in December 2002 was that the introduction of more widespread pay and display car parks had caused some problems. People unwilling to pay had, in some cases, either overstayed their time in limited waiting areas or overfilled free off-street car parks or parked in local residential streets. Possible ways of reducing these adverse effects could include improved enforcement of existing regulations, introducing charges to on-street parking areas and varying parking charges between town centre and peripheral car parks. Problems were not considered at the time very severe but could be reduced. Removing charges and returning to the previous non-charging regime could be considered but this would likely be costly and re-introduce the problem of over-demand for free spaces in some areas.

4.13 A follow up review of the operation of Pay Parking was reported to the Executive in February 2004, where it was agreed that a Parking Policy for the Council be prepared. The resultant Parking Strategy was approved by the Executive on 25 March 2008. The core objective of the Strategy is "to provide a consistent parking framework across the Scottish Borders Council area". Other objectives related to environment, safety, economy, integration and accessibility. In the development of the Strategy, 3 sets of problems were identified:

- Problems arising from the balance between supply and demand
- Problems arising from inconsiderate or illegal usage
- Specific issues affecting particular groups or locations.

The Parking Strategy advocates a number of ways in which these problems can be addressed through using all available space; managing demand through restrictions and charges; encouraging the use of non-car modes; providing extra supply where possible; and improving enforcement of restrictions.

4.14 On 29 June 2016, Council agreed to fund parking studies in key towns across the Borders in response to work by the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Working Group. The results of these parking studies, undertaken by Streetwise, were reported to Council on 10 November 2016. For each site, the key areas looked at were occupancy levels, duration of stay and turnover. In addition, the parking of individual vehicles was analysed to illustrate illegal parking behaviour, such as parking on single and/or double yellow lines. Analysis of the survey returns demonstrated that certain town centres were very busy in terms of on-street parking and could, on occasion, operate at or above capacity. In overall town centre terms, this was relatively rare, with only a 14% incidence of a town centre being at or over parking capacity in a 30 minute period. These occurrences were restricted to Galashiels, Kelso, Peebles, and, to a much lesser extent, Selkirk.

4.15 At the meeting of the Parking Issues Working Group held on 17 May 2018, consideration was given to comments received from Elected Members on parking issues in their wards. The issues raised at this meeting, combined with the findings of the studies in 2002 and 2016 are as follows:

(a) Berwickshire

- Coldstream, High Street (Elected Members 2018) – HGV issues ; pinch points
- Duns (2016) - 80% of drivers were parking on-street for less than 1 hour; occupancy was at a manageable level with on-street parking ranging from 40% to 80% of capacity. Turnover was generally high and in restricted parking areas there was occasional short term parking on single yellow lines but double yellow lines much better observed; evidence of short term parking in bus bays.
- Duns (Elected Members 2018) - congestion at bus stop area opposite main car park in Market Square; suggestion that one-way system in North Street would be better reversed
- Eyemouth (2002) – poor compliance with parking restrictions (15.6%) with occupancy over capacity, particularly evident in Manse Road, with parking overflowed on to the restricted areas.
- Eyemouth (2016) - 67% of drivers were parking on-street for less than 1 hour; 16% of drivers stayed for 3 or more hours; and 5% were in place all day. Occupancy varied between 43% and 67%. Turnover was mixed with the best results in the High Street and Market Place. Some incidents of vehicles illegally parking for much

longer periods than permitted in Home Street and in Market Place (opposite the Royal Bank of Scotland); 66 vehicles were observed parking on double yellow lines in the Market Place area.

- Eyemouth (Elected Members 2018) – condition of Co-op car park

(b) Cheviot

- Jedburgh (August 2016) – 73% of drivers parked for less than 1 hour; on one of the survey days, occupancy levels were between 73% to 84%, particularly in Exchange Street. Turnover was mixed, with best turnover in the central and northern areas of the High Street. In restricted parking areas there was a high level of overstaying the 45 minute time limit in all areas, especially in mid High Street, Canongate and Castlegate; issues with short-term parking on single and double yellow lines.
- Jedburgh (Elected Members 2018) – double yellow lines faded at The Friars; congestion at Co-op access
- Kelso (2002) – in the restricted waiting areas the level of non-compliance to restrictions in Coalmarket and Bridge Street needed to be addressed. Some spare capacity was observed during the before study, but these areas operated at near capacity for most of the period in the after study. In unlimited waiting an adequate level of on-street unlimited parking was available during both surveys.
- Kelso (2016) - 60% of drivers parking on-street for less than 30 minutes with a further 20% staying for up to 1 hour; overall occupancy was at a high level at some points during each day; turnover was good; issues were observed at a section of double yellow lines in Woodmarket and also at single yellow line at cash machine in Bridge Street
- Kelso (Elected Members 2018) – abuse of regulations is a problem and better enforcement is needed; need for more parking provision but sites unidentified; spaces required outside cash machine in Bridge Street and better enforcement needed. The car park at Business Units could be made more available to the public if the pedestrian gate was unlocked and signage to High Street added.
- St Boswells (Elected Members 2018) – issue with supply vs demand.

(c) Eildon

- Galashiels (2016) – general compliance with the 1 hour restriction with the majority of vehicles moving on in Bank Street and some parts of High Street and Channel Street; a number of vehicles stayed for 6 or more hours in the High Street (near Bridge Street) and at the lower end of Channel Street (near the cinema); occupancy levels were above 85%; good turnover all through the town on limited waiting except in parts of the High Street and Channel Street; areas of single yellow lines being used for short-term parking in the High Street and parts of Channel Street.

- Galashiels (Elected Members 2018) - disabled issues in Bank Street & Channel Street; resident parking issues in Galapark; query whether the double yellow lines were still required outside the old Abbotsford Hotel. A dropping off point for passengers was required at the Transport Interchange.
 - Melrose (2016) - 55% of vehicles stayed for 30 mins, with a further 20% staying for up to 1 hour; overall, occupancy rates did not exceed capacity; turnover was highest in the restricted waiting areas on Market Square and High Street. In Buccleuch Street, there were regular occurrences of vehicles parking for short periods in the marked bus stop.
 - Selkirk (2002) - 10% non-compliance with 30 mins restricted waiting times; always spare capacity in The Valley but other areas were at or near capacity for most of the survey period. There was always an adequate level of on-street unlimited parking available throughout the town during both survey periods.
 - Selkirk (2016) - 80% of drivers parked on-street for less than 1 hour; less than 10% stayed for 3 or more hours. Occupancy levels were at a high level on some occasions, often driven by a high degree of illegal parking rather than a lack of actual spaces. Turnover was mixed and there was also evidence of short to medium term parking on areas of zig zag lines, at dropped kerbs and in disabled bays when not entitled to do so.
- (d) Teviot & Liddesdale
- Hawick (2002) - 30 mins restricted waiting operated at near capacity; always unlimited on-street parking available.
 - Hawick (August 2016) - 85% of vehicles stayed for under an hour at a time; the central area was at times close to, but always below, capacity; turnover was mixed across the area, with poor turnover in O'Connell Street, with reasonable to good turnover in most of the High Street and the north side of Bourtree Place. In the main most restricted parking sections were well observed, with the exception being a 26 metre length on the High Street where there was much more regular abuse; there was also some vehicles parked or waiting for short periods on zig-zag markings, keep clears and disabled bays when not entitled to do so.
 - Hawick (Elected Members 2018) - issues with parking on crest of hill and visibility in Frank Place; loading at shops and a need for dedicated parking bays in North Bridge/Oliver Place. A suggestion was made to consider widening Northcote Street to allow parking without causing an obstruction. Parking at the junction was causing obstruction at High Street/O'Connell Street. Issues arising from parking at the junction in Wilton Park Road and near accesses to the new play park.

(e) Tweeddale

- Innerleithen (August 2016) - 55% of vehicles were present for 30 mins, with a further 10-15% gone within 1 hour; 17-23% of vehicles were in place for 3 or more hours; occupancy levels were always well within capacity. There were mixed results for turnover, with the best being the north side of the High Street at the west end and on the south side of the High Street at the east end. In restricted parking areas, there was short duration mis-use of single yellow line parking on a 61 metre length of the High Street and a 31 metre length of Chapel Street; there was occasional short-term parking at dropped kerbs, bus stops and in disabled bays when not entitled to do so.
- Peebles (2002) – 11.4% stayed for 1 hour or longer on the on-street restricted to 45 mins, particularly in the High Street. There was always spare capacity with the majority of this being in Northgate. For unrestricted waiting, Dean Park had seen a large increase in use, with less turnover of spaces in Biggiesknowe, Greenside and Bridgegate, and more turnover in Tweed Green. There was always an adequate level of on-street unlimited parking available but Greenside and Tweed Green used to capacity.
- Peebles (2013) – wide variance in the length of period vehicles were parked; overall occupancy was regularly at a high level, approaching capacity on some occasions.
- Peebles (2016) – wide variance in the length of period vehicles were parked; 60% of vehicles parked for 30 mins with a further 20% staying for 1 hour. Turnover was generally good. Parking and waiting was observed at double yellow lines but this was at a fairly low level and typically only for short periods at a time.
- West Linton (2016) – up to 70% vehicles were parked on the Main Street for less than 1 hour, with 20% staying for 3 or more hours; average stays in Raemartin Square of 4 to 5 hours. Occupancy levels on Main Street were at manageable levels, but higher in Raemartin Square, at times reaching capacity. There was a level of illegal parking on single yellow lines from 7:00 to 10:00 am regulated time.
- West Linton (Elected Members 2018) – issues in Main Street for disabled parking, general layout and lack of availability of parking; drivers unwilling to walk any distance so Lower Green underused. A query was made as to whether Deanfoot Road would be better as a one-way street.

4.16 Also at the meeting of the Parking Working Group held on 17 May 2018, Councillor Tatler advised that he was carrying out an on-line parking survey (using Survey Monkey) in Tweeddale which he had promoted through social

media, his own Ward newsletter and in the local press. Members of the Group were keen to have this survey extended to the other localities in the Borders and it was placed on the Council's website (using the Citizen Space on-line survey tool) from 25 May to 30 June 2018, being publicized through a press release and social media.

4.17 In total, the two surveys received 810 responses (670 through Citizen Space and 140 through Survey Monkey). The analysis of the results is contained in Appendix 1 to this report with the main points from each of the questions in the survey being:

1. Do you use a public car park or on-street parking? *76% of respondents report parking in both car parks and on-street.*
2. How long would you typically park for? *Just under half of the respondents stated they park for less than 1 hour.*
3. Should there be a charge at all public car parks, 7 days a week? *87% of respondents do not want charging at public car parks 7 days a week.*
4. Respondents were asked to rank the main parking issues from 1 to 4 for inconsiderate, dangerous or illegal parking; lack of on-street parking spaces; lack of public car park spaces; and people parking for longer than they should. *57% of respondents indicate that inconsiderate, dangerous or illegal parking is a key parking issue in the Scottish Borders.*
5. Parking offences are currently the responsibility of the Police in the Scottish Borders. Would you like this changed to allow Scottish Borders Council or a private company to take on this responsibility. *57% of respondents indicated that they would to have Scottish Borders Council or a private company take on the responsibility of parking enforcement. It should be noted that the question did not have details about costs or how it would function. During the survey time, the Police Community Action Team came into force and addressing parking issues can form part of the Team's tasks.*
6. Respondents were asked to rank possible methods for controlling on-street parking through either a disc system; greater police enforcement or parking permits. *47% of respondents preferred greater police enforcement; 33% preferred a disc system; and 18% preferred parking permits.*

4.18 The survey also gave respondents an opportunity to provide further comments and 490 (60%) providing additional comments:

- Many respondents highlighted specific locations where there were parking issues e.g. High Street in Peebles, around Kingsland School in

Peebles, town centre in Selkirk, Bank Street in Galashiels, and The Square in Kelso.

- Over 30% of respondents specifically highlighted inconsiderate/illegal/dangerous parking.
 - 23% of respondents made further requests for parking monitoring and enforcement.
 - Over 12% of respondents proposed alternative options to address parking issues. One respondent suggested: "How about a campaign to '**park fair**' i.e. not overstaying your time as it affects businesses? I know shopkeepers who leave their cars outside their shop all day. They can't see the obvious. Spell it out to them. Make people think their unfair parking is affecting their friends and neighbours' livelihoods who work in our shops. Make them aware. Make them take responsibility. Train them into realizing it's wrong."
 - Over 10% of respondents felt that a key parking issue was locals and shopkeepers parking longer than allowed, with Kelso and Selkirk identified specifically.
 - 9% specifically requested more parking.
 - 9% highlighted issues related to disabled parking spaces or access on a pavement due to poor parking.
 - Some respondents highlighted that there was an unwillingness to park further away from a town centre and walk.
- 4.19 Councillor Robson also carried out a parking survey in Kelso using the Survey Monkey website, which was further informed by a public meeting sponsored by Kelso Community Council, a meeting with Visit Kelso and representations from members of the public. A total of 201 responses were received. A copy of the results is attached as Appendix 2 to this report, with the main points being:
- 2 hour on-street restrictions suit the majority
 - 12.5% of respondents needed to park all day
 - 84% opposed the introduction of any parking charges
 - A majority favoured a disc system similar to those of neighbouring authorities
 - Over 75% of respondents wished to see more parking spaces made available
- 4.20 From the various studies/surveys carried out in 2002, 2016 and 2018, it can be seen that in some cases, the same issues are being raised:
- a minority of people are parking in restricted areas (single yellow and double yellow lines)
 - a minority of people are parking for longer than they should in areas with restricted waiting times
 - there are specific areas within some towns where capacity is perceived to be an issue
 - greater monitoring and enforcement of parking is being requested

Scope: The legal position for parking restrictions and enforcement

- 4.21 Under the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, on-street parking transgressions in the Scottish Borders remain a criminal offence and enforcement responsibility lies solely with Police Scotland, despite their withdrawal of the Traffic Warden Service. From February 2014, Police Scotland focused on the core activity of keeping people safe. Where parking was dangerous or caused significant obstruction, Police Scotland would task police officers to resolve the issue using the appropriate enforcement activity, including parking tickets, other direct measures or prosecution reports. In 2017, Police Scotland outlined in their Standard Operating Procedure for Parking, Abandoned Vehicles and Vehicle Excise Licensing that *'Fixed Penalty Notices can be issued under this Act for offences such as, but not limited to:*
- *parking on yellow lines where prohibited*
 - *parking on-street where stated time restrictions are exceeded*
 - *parking within a metered bay*
 - *parking within a disabled bay where parking is prohibited other than that of a permit holder.*
- 4.22 The Road Traffic Act 1991 introduced provisions enabling the decriminalization of non-endorsable parking offences, which was extended to Scotland in June 1997. This allowed local authorities to undertake Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) and changed the nature of parking offences from criminal to civil. While the preference of Police Scotland is for local authorities to take over parking enforcement, police officers have continued to enforce parking restrictions in the Scottish Borders where time and manpower has allowed.
- 4.23 The Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012 provides the Council with the mechanism to require the police to address parking enforcement as part of the local policing plan through section 45(3) of the Act, which states "a local authority may specify policing measures that it wishes the local commander to include in a local policing plan." The Council is also afforded the opportunity to request performance information on parking enforcement through section 45(5)(a) of the Act which states "a local commander must provide to the local authority such reports on the carrying out of police functions in its areas (including by reference to any local policing plan in force for the area)."

Scope: Other Councils' solutions

- 4.24 As of April 2018, 11 of the 32 Scottish local authorities have not introduced Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE). In January 2018, Aberdeenshire Council considered a report on the possibility of introducing DPE, following a feasibility study. Members agreed not to proceed with DPE due to the financial burden it would put on the authority in the short to medium term. The Council car parks budget was overspent. In 2013 the Western Isles Council had negotiated a way forward with Police Scotland for the continuation of the local traffic warden service on a shared funding basis. In December 2015, Western Isles Council's P&R Committee agreed to contact Police Scotland with the proposal to develop a shared arrangement to traffic

management and parking enforcement. Western Isles now have a 5 year contract in place (from June 2016) for Police Scotland to provide 1 Traffic Warden.

- 4.25 For those Councils which have brought in Decriminalised parking enforcement, many report successful implementation. The large urban authorities have the greatest success, with a smaller geographic area to cover, larger population and current off- and on-street parking charge regimes. The advantages to such schemes are that enforcement is under Council control and means attendants can be directed to priority areas when required; congestion is removed; the network is well managed and safer; and income is retained. Set against this is the permanent obligation on the Council to continue with enforcement – there is no opportunity to reverse the process once an Order is made; the risk that over time income does not meet all costs; the need to charge for some parking or subsidise the scheme; and parking charges are unlikely to be popular.

Scope: Options for parking including potential additional spaces, restrictions, control and enforcement.

- 4.26 The main town centres were examined to see if there was any potential for the creation of additional parking spaces, either on- or off-street. Due to the historic layout and nature of Borders towns, officers have been unable to identify further potential off-street parking areas. From the comments received within the most recent survey, there have been a number of suggestions for changes, including:

- Parking bays should be made bigger to accommodate modern vehicle sizes
- Town centre car parks should be free to encourage people to park there
- Length of taxi ranks could be reduced in some places
- Payment for parking over phone or on app*
- Greater enforcement of restrictions on regular basis
- Change to diagonal spaces (e.g. High Street, Peebles; Bank Street, Galashiels)
- Mark out individual bays in on street parking
- Provide more disabled parking bays on-street in town centres
- Increase directional signs to car parks
- Mark dropped kerbs
- Campaign to "park fair", pointing out the impact on businesses and tourism if people park beyond the time restrictions

**Note: The Council already operates "RingGo" as an option for payments in their Pay and Display car parks.*

- 4.27 In terms of control and enforcement of parking restrictions, at the moment the Council monitors and controls off-street parking and Police Scotland enforces on-street parking. From April 2018 the Council has funded a Police Community Action Team (Sergeant and 6 police officers) to enhance the

delivery of the local Policy Plan and the Scottish Borders Community Plan; provide a high profile police presence to deter crime and disorder; and give a flexible police response based on identified incidents and intelligence. Parking issues forms part of the work of the Team. An example of their work was in Woodmarket and Bridge Street in Kelso, where parking patrols were carried out and number of tickets issued over 3 months, including 24 tickets issued in one day. The whole of the Borders has received attention in relation to dangerous and inconsiderate parking, with 632 tickets issued so far along with advice and warnings.

- 4.28 To implement Decriminalised Parking Enforcement, a local authority applies to Scottish Government for a Designation Order which decriminalises parking enforcement across the whole of the Council area. It is not possible for the Council to be selective in its application e.g. only large towns. From the date set in the Order, police will be unable to enforce the majority of parking related offences and the local authority takes on the responsibility of enforcing on-street parking, waiting and loading restrictions. Once enforcement powers are transferred from the police to the local authority, the process cannot be reversed. Traffic Regulation Orders within the whole of the local authority area would be reviewed and remarked as required. As well as employing parking attendants, the local authority would need to put in place back office support to process penalty charge notices (parking tickets) either in-house or procured through another authority or private company.
- 4.29 Officers are also currently drafting an Off-Street Parking Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), due to go out for public consultation shortly, which details the classes of vehicles which can use off-street parking bays, time limitations for such use, and prohibits some vehicles e.g. caravan, horse trailer, from being permanently kept in a parking place. Elected Members have already been consulted on this Draft TRO and will also be consulted for a second time during the public consultation.

Scope: Fully costed options for any recommendations.

- 4.30 The Council already has budget/costs associated with off-street parking management, currently employing 3 Parking Attendants, each working 20 hours per week for the management of off-street parking, as well as 1 Parking Supervisor working 28 hours per week. The costs in 2017/18 associated with Off-Street parking were:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| • Expenditure – Employees | £ 53,265 |
| • Expenditure – Transport and Related Costs | £ 11,031 |
| • Expenditure – Other | £ 79,331 |
| • Income | (£160,420) |
| • Surplus | (£ 16,793) |

- 4.31 Income from off-street car parking (fees and penalty charges) can vary considerably from year to year. Although income in 2017/18 was £160,420

(the highest level), in 2014/15 income was £98,950, resulting in a net loss to the service of -£16,158. In the same vein, other expenditure also varies from a high in 2017/18 of £79,331, to a low of £26,850 in 2013/14, giving a surplus in that financial year of £40,590.

4.32 Any changes to on-street parking arrangements will require a review of existing Traffic Regulation Orders and the production of a single TRO to include each of the following towns (cost per 35 hour week @£25 per hour = £875 per week; average TRO publication £1,500):

- Galashiels – 8 weeks + TRO publication = £8,500
- Hawick – 6 weeks + TRO publication = £6,750
- Eyemouth - 6 weeks + TRO publication = £6,750
- Peebles - 6 weeks + TRO publication = £6,750
- Coldstream – 4 weeks + TRO publication = £5,000
- Jedburgh - 4 weeks + TRO publication = £5,000
- Kelso - 3 weeks + TRO publication = £4,125
- Selkirk - 3 weeks + TRO publication = £4,125
- Innerleithen – 2 weeks + TRO publication = £3,250
- Melrose – 2 weeks + TRO publication = £3,250
- TOTAL Cost of above = £53,500

4.33 Any changes to TROs may also require changes to signage. Each sign can cost an average of £20 to manufacture and £80 to erect i.e. £100 per sign. If parking times are to be amended, TROs can have from 10 – 40 signs needing changed and typically average around 30 in the larger towns. Assuming an average of 20 signs per town at a cost of £2,000, then the total cost for amendments in the 10 towns in paragraph 4.32 would be £20,000

4.34 Until the extent of works required for each town for changes or renewal of TRO lining is known, then an estimate can be made based on a 3-man squad with lining lorry and extruder at an average daily rate of £1,000. Costs for each town are therefore estimated as:

- Galashiels – 6 days = £6,000
- Hawick – 6 days = £6,000
- Eyemouth – 2 days = £2,000
- Peebles – 5 days = £5,000
- Coldstream – 2 days = £2,000
- Jedburgh – 3 days = £3,000
- Kelso – 4 days = £4,000
- Selkirk – 4 days = £4,000
- Innerleithen – 3 days = £3,000
- Melrose – 3 days = £3,000
- TOTAL Cost of above = £38,000

4.35 The approximate costs for Decriminalised Parking Enforcement for the Council have been estimated as:

| | | One-off cost | Additional Ongoing yearly cost |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Preparation of DPE Application | Consultants | £60,000 | |
| Buchanan Computing | TRO Loading TRO Review | £72,000 | £3,500 |
| Signs and Lines | Replacement of missing signs/ lines from TRO review | £45,000 | £4,000 |
| Disc Parking signing amendments | Sign manufacture and erection | £50,000 | £2,000 |
| Parking discs | Purchase of 50,000 without advertising | £12,000 | £2,000 |
| Additional staff | 0.7 FTE Back Office staff | | £20,500 |
| Additional staff | 1.8 FTE Parking Attendants | | £36,000 |
| Vehicles | 1 x New Van (assume lease) | | £7,500 |
| Handhelds | Upgrade x 5 New x 1 | £4,000 | £750 |
| Software | Upgrade | £10,000 | |
| Uniforms | New/Replacement uniforms | £1,250 | £250 |
| Ancillary | Stationary Telephones | £750 £1,250 | £250 £1,250 |
| Training | | £6,000 | |
| Publicity/advertising | | £11,000 | |
| 20% contingency/optimism bias | | £54,650 | |
| TOTAL COST | | £327,900 | £78,000 |
| Income anticipated | Based on Argyll & Bute Council rate @ 1300, based on 80% paid without challenge [15% @£60, 62% @ £30 and 3% @ £90]; and 20% appealed/contested and recovered @ £22 | | -£45,110 |
| OR | Based on current Police CAT rate @ | | -£31,924 |

| | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | 920, based on 80% paid without challenge [15% @£60, 62% @ £30 and 3% @ £90]; and 20% appealed/contested and recovered @ £22 | | |
| Ongoing deficit | | | £32,890 or £46,076 |

4.36 This gives an initial set up cost for DPE of £327,900, with additional annual running costs of £78,000, making a total of £405,000 for the first year of operation. The additional annual running costs would mean the DPE service would have a potential annual deficit of between £32,890 and £46,076, depending on the amount of income received. These estimated running costs do not include any additional management, software licensing or training. A full assessment of all costs would need to be carried out prior to any consideration of DPE as an option for the Council. It may be possible to spread some of the initial one-off and implementation costs over a 3 year period. All income from both off- and on-street parking would be managed in one budget, with any surplus being returned to a fund for transport infrastructure across the Borders. This would be a change from the current surplus which is spent in specific towns.

4.37 With regard to the specific Recommendations within this report, an estimate has been made of the costs associated with each one:

(a) Recommendation One (Review of TROs) – Estimated cost £205k in-house or £225k external

Very significant staff resources are required to undertake a review of Traffic Regulation Orders, with individual larger towns taking up to 8 weeks full-time work each for one member of staff, which would in turn impact on the normal workload. If this work was to be undertaken in-house using existing staff then this could only be carried out over a number of years. The costs in manpower to the Service, based on an average for the 10 largest towns (£25 per hour) would be £40,000. If consultants were employed for this work, then costs would be at least £60,000. Additional costs would then include:

TRO publications - £15,000

Replacement signs - £20,000

Replacement lines - £10,000

These costs assume limited changes, with a full re-refresh of signs and lines nearer £150,000.

Total costs = £85,000 (in-house) to £105,000 (external consultants) and if a major refresh was required of signs and lines then these would increase to £205,000 (in-house) to £225,000.

- (b) Recommendation Two (Car parking directional signage) – Estimated cost £28,500
Staff resources would be required to check existing signage and produce findings of replacement/new signs. These have been estimated at an average of 2 days per town (£175 per day), with a cost to the Service of £3,500. Capital/revenue costs of implementing any changes would depend on the findings but an estimate of £2,500 per town gives a total cost of £25,000 for advance directional signs plus repeaters.
- (c) Recommendation Three (Updating single and double yellow lining; parking bay review; dropped kerbs) – Estimated cost from £28,250 up to £278,250.
Significant additional staff resource would be required to undertake full updating of single and double yellow lines across the region. There is currently some limited budget in each locality for basic line maintenance work, but to renew all lining would cost an estimated £25,000 per location, with that cost not including an allowance for any road repairs required. Staff resources would also be required to check and produce findings for any changes to existing parking bays from parallel to diagonal. Estimated cost for this is £1,750. Scope for any change is expected to be limited as there could be an impact on road safety if there was to be increased reversing out of spaces. Estimated costs for changes on the ground are up to £15,000 depending on findings. Staff resources would also be required to check and produce findings for specific marking of dropped kerbs, with this estimated at £3,500. The actual work of marking dropped kerbs in town centres is estimated as £8,000.
- (d) Recommendation Four (media campaign to “park fair”) – Estimated cost £10,000
Staff resource would be required to implement this, with accompanying advertising, printing and radio costs estimated at £10,000.
- (e) Recommendation Five (Enforcement regimes for parking) – Estimated costs from £20,000 to £327,900
The Council is currently funding the Police Community Action Team and a portion of their work includes parking enforcement. Should decriminalised parking enforcement be introduced, there are initial start-up costs of £327,900 with an estimated annual operating deficit of up to £47,360, depending on the number of penalty charges issued.
- (f) Recommendation Six (Feasibility study) – Estimated cost £35,000
This would require appointment of specialist consultants to carry out a feasibility study on one or two town centres to evaluate the potential impact of housing and other developments and provide the Council with a longer term parking management policy. Estimated cost for this is £35,000.

Section 5: KEY FINDINGS and RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

- 5.1 It is clear that parking in the Scottish Borders attracts much comment. Having reviewed all the information requested and put to them, Members of the Working Group have concluded that much of the comment made and received is based on perception or anecdotal evidence and the details provided to Members in terms of number of parking spaces available is sufficient for most days in most towns. Human behaviour is such that some people think it acceptable to park “just for a minute” in an inappropriate place and once one person does so, others follow suit. Off street car parks are often not used to their full extent if they are not in the immediate vicinity of people’s work or where they wish to shop. While non-car use is encouraged, people seem to be reluctant to walk other than for a very short distance from where they park.
- 5.2 It has been extremely helpful for the Working Group to have received comments from members of the public as part of the surveys which were carried out. While many of these comments raised issues, there were very few ideas put forward as to how these could be resolved. The need for more parking places was highlighted but historic town layouts mean finding additional space is rarely possible. More directional signposting of both short and longer stay on and off-street parking options in towns would be helpful for visitors. Waiting restrictions vary across Border towns and it would be helpful if there was greater consistency. A review of existing Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) would also provide clarity by having one TRO for each town.
- 5.3 Enforcement of parking and waiting restrictions is seen as a continuing issue. The misconception still remains that it was the Council which had employed and then removed the Traffic Warden service, rather than Police Scotland. The Council investment in the Police Community Action Team may go some way to assisting with enforcement but as the Team has only been in place since April 2018 it is too early to make a judgement on its effectiveness in terms of parking. The Council employs parking attendants to monitor and enforce its off-street car parks and they could be further deployed to monitor on-street parking and advise the police of areas of concern. Cost will need to be included as a determining factor in any future enforcement regime. It is unlikely to be affordable for parking attendants to be permanently based and patrolling each town on a daily basis.

Recommendation One

- 5.4 A review of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) should be carried out to simplify and amalgamate these and produce one TRO for the whole of the Borders covering all towns. This review should include changes to waiting times so that all Border towns have standard restricted waiting periods of 1 and/or 2 hour periods, with a 1 hour return period; and such restrictions shall operate Monday to Saturday from 08:30 to 17:30, which will provide a greater

degree of consistency across the Borders. In terms of waiting times, each Councillor should be asked what they would like to see within their towns – 1 hour restriction, 2 hour restriction or a combination.

Estimated cost = £205,000 (in-house) or £225,000 (external)

Recommendation Two

- 5.5 Directional signage to both long and short term for on and off-street parking should be reviewed to ensure that sufficient signage is in place to direct visitors to the most appropriate parking.

Estimated cost = £28,500

Recommendation Three

- 5.6 Updating of single and double yellow and white line marking should continue as part of the planned ongoing programme across the Borders to ensure clarity on parking restrictions. A review of parking bays should also be carried out to ascertain whether any changes can be made e.g. from parallel to diagonal parking, to increase the number of spaces available, or whether marking specific bays in on-street parking would also be of help. Specific marking to identify dropped kerbs may also be a benefit.

Estimated cost = from £28,250 up to £278,250

Recommendation Four

- 5.7 A media campaign should be held as part of the Council's *#yourpart* initiative to encourage people to "park fair". This could include the impact of parking on pavements and next to dropped kerbs (hindrance to buggy and wheelchair users), in bus laybys (buses then block traffic), and overstaying time limited parking areas (impacts on the economic viability of town centres if there is insufficient turnover). Flouting restrictions shows a lack of respect for other drivers and users of town centres, both local and visitors. Information should also be included on the Council's website on the location, duration and cost of parking in each of the main towns.

Estimated cost = £10,000

Recommendation Five

- 5.8 Full costs in the consideration of potential different enforcement regimes – including timescales for development and implementation - should be developed (e.g. existing regime including use of the Police Community Action Team, or Decriminalised Parking Enforcement, etc.) with any options considered as part of the Council's future budget planning process.

Estimated cost = from £20,000 to £327,900

Recommendation Six

- 5.9 In order to help future-proof parking in town centres, at one point during the remaining term of this Council, a feasibility study should be carried out on one or two town centres to take account of the potential impact of future housing and other developments over a 10 year period. This will help ascertain what other infrastructure could be put in place in Borders' historic

town centres to decrease congestion and provide the Council with a longer term parking management policy.

Estimated cost = £35,000

- 5.10 Should all recommendations be accepted, then Council would need to consider finding between £326,750 and £904,650 of additional funding within its future years' budgets. Some of these costs may be split over a number of years. Given the amount of additional funding required (should all these recommendations be accepted) Area Partnerships could be consulted to identify where parking issues sit in terms of priority for spend within each particular locality.

Consultation

- 5.11 *In reaching its conclusions, the Working Group has consulted with the Council's Corporate Management Team to ensure that in terms of its findings, the recommendations it is making are practical and achievable.*

Background Papers

Scottish Borders Council:

Executive Committee Report – 17 December 2002 – “On-Street Parking”

Executive Committee Report – 25 March 2008 – “Parking Strategy for the Scottish Borders”

Scottish Borders Council Report – 12 December 2013 – “Traffic Warden Review”

Environment & Infrastructure Committee – 20 March 2014 – “Traffic Warden Review”

Scottish Borders Council Report – 29 June 2016 – “On-Street Parking and Traffic Management”

Scottish Borders Council Report – 10 November 2016 – “On-Street Parking and Traffic Management”

Scottish Borders Council Update – 23 February 2017 – “On-Street Parking and Traffic Management”

Other Councils:

Aberdeenshire Council: Report to Infrastructure Services Committee – 25 January 2018 – “Management of Car Parking in Aberdeenshire”

Angus Council: Report to Policy and Resources Committee – 10 October 2017 – “Decriminalised Parking Enforcement – Update”

Argyll & Bute Council: Report to Environment Development and Infrastructure Committee – 13 August 2015 - “Decriminalised Parking”

Comhairle nan Eilean Siar: Report to Transport & Infrastructure Committee – 2 December 2015 – “Traffic Management and Parking Enforcement”

Moray Council: Report to Economic Development & Infrastructure Services Committee – 31 October 2017 – “Elgin Parking Strategy”

Also:

Scottish Government – 21 December 2017 – “Decriminalised Parking Enforcement – Local Authorities – Income and Expenditure – 2016 to 2017”