1. Introduction

1.1. This technical note has been produced by Key Transport Consultants (KTC) on instructions received from the University of Bristol (UoB) to consider the potential introduction of parking restrictions on Elmlea and Rylestone Grove in response to local residents’ concerns regarding students living in the nearby UoB residential halls, whom residents believe to be parking their vehicles on local roads.

1.2. The analysis is informed by surveys undertaken on behalf of the UoB and by anecdotal evidence presented by local residents.

1.3. Parking beat surveys were undertaken on Thursday 19th March and Thursday 16th April 2015 as part of an agreed Parking Management Plan (PMP) for the UoB Stoke Bishop Residential Campus, which was produced to satisfy a planning condition related to the introduction of additional student accommodation at Hiatt Baker Hall in Stoke Bishop. The 2015 surveys followed on from surveys in 2008 and 2012/13, which were undertaken through the planning and construction periods for the additional rooms at Hiatt Baker Hall.

1.4. The 2015 surveys were the last set of surveys required in the PMP and are available at [http://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/estates/documents/parking_survey_2015v2_0.pdf](http://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/estates/documents/parking_survey_2015v2_0.pdf).

2. On-street parking

2.1. The results of the 2015 surveys and comparison with the 2013 survey results suggested that some of the cars parked on Elmlea in 2015 were likely to be owned by students. However, due to restrictions on obtaining information about the registered owner of a vehicle parked legally on the public highway from the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DLVA) it is not possible to prove this to be the case. The results for Rylestone Grove were less clear and at all times there was plenty of space to park on Rylestone Grove.

2.2. No illegal parking was recorded on either Elmlea or Rylestone Grove and the level of parking was generally accommodated within the space available on the two roads.

2.3. It is noted that students living at the Stoke Bishop Campus have the same right to park a taxed and insured vehicle on the public highway as residents living along Elmlea and Rylestone Grove, or anywhere else in the UK. Some local residents have claimed that it is possible for the
UoB to restrict these rights and have cited examples of other Universities that have introduced policies to this effect. The UoB have taken legal advice to confirm that they are unable to restrict these rights through the contracts signed by students living in the Halls, as the terms would be considered unfair and unenforceable.

3. Mitigation

3.1. Following the production of the 2015 parking survey report, two meetings were held to which residents of Elmlea and Rylestone Grove were invited. At the first meeting the findings of the parking surveys were shared and at the second meeting a series of mitigation options were considered.

3.2. Based on the survey results and the feedback from residents at the first of these meetings on the 23rd July 2015, it is KTC’s professional opinion that the only mitigation required is the introduction of additional parking restrictions on Elmlea on the approach to its junction with Parrys Lane. Residents advised and KTC staff have observed that at busy times during the day (such as at school collection times) the proximity of legally parked cars to the give-way line meant that vehicles were unable to turn into Elmlea from Parrys Lane because their path was obstructed by a queue of vehicles trying to turn out of Elmlea. It was explained by local residents that they had witnessed vehicles having to reverse back onto Parrys Lane due to this problem. Extending the existing double yellow lines along Elmlea would tackle this potential safety issue.

3.3. At the second residents meeting on the 10th September 2015 a series of mitigation options were presented. These were:

- Option 1: Additional double yellow lines on Elmlea on the approach to its junction with Parrys Lane;
- Option 2: As Option 1, plus the introduction of double yellow lines around the junction of Elmlea and Rylestone Grove;
- Option 3: Introduction of one-way working westbound on Elmlea, preventing vehicles from turning in from Parrys Lane;
- Option 4: As Option 3, with the introduction of one-way working on Rylestone Grove from northwest to southeast;
- Option 5: The introduction of limited waiting restrictions (4 hours maximum stay) and double yellow lines on Elmlea and Rylestone Grove to prevent all day parking and rationalise parking locations to ensure that access was maintained for large emergency and service vehicles.
3.4. KTC’s advice to UoB and the residents is that the residents should seek the implementation of Option 1, as this would address the only potential safety issue identified through this process and at the same time prevent parking in the only area where possible student parking was identified.

3.5. However, following the presentation of the options at the 10th September meeting, many of the residents attending did not consider that any of the options addressed their concerns, which were chiefly focused on limiting the opportunity for students or commuters to park.

3.6. The residents asked for a further option to be considered. This would see the introduction of waiting restrictions on both sides of Elmlea and Rylestone Grove designed to prevent vehicles from parking for one hour per day in the middle part of the day. For each side of each road the period of restriction would be “staggered”, with a different hour specified. In theory this would allow residents to park on-street all day, provided they moved their car to the opposite side of the road at the appropriate time. Students or commuters would be expected to be away from their cars during the restricted hours, so they would be unable to move them each day and would, therefore, be discouraged from parking on the roads.

3.7. Residents said that they were aware of places near railway stations in London where a similar one hour restriction scheme had been introduced to prevent commuter parking. KTC consider the proposed staggered restriction arrangement to be highly unusual and are not aware of anywhere where it has been successfully implemented.

3.8. Since the meeting, in discussions with Bristol City Council (BCC), KTC has been informed that a one hour restriction period proposed on nearby Shaplands would not be acceptable to BCC because of the resource implications of scheduling enforcement visits within such a tight window.

3.9. In spite of the above advice, as requested, KTC has prepared a sixth option based on the “staggered parking” suggestion of the local residents, which is attached to this Technical Note. Drawing 0415-016 shows a scheme with parking restrictions preventing parking between 11:00 and 12:00 on one side of the road, and restrictions preventing parking on the other side of the road between 12:00 and 13:00. The introduction of formal parking restrictions would probably require the introduction of double yellow lines across each driveway. Parking would also need to be prevented in areas where conflicts between stationary vehicles and through traffic may result in delays, obstruction or potential safety issues. If there is a strong level of support from the local community the residents could put forward these proposals to BCC.
4. Implementation

4.1. As explained to residents at the September meeting, the implementation of any parking restrictions would require a Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) to be introduced. In order to confirm, or in legal parlance, make, a TRO, the local highway authority would need to advertise their intention to make the TRO and objections may be raised. In deciding whether to make the TRO the local authority would need to take account of any objections and, if a substantial number of objections were lodged, particularly from local residents, then the local authority would be unlikely to make the TRO.

4.2. It is, therefore, important that any scheme receives a high level of support from residents living on Elmlea and Rylestone Grove.

4.3. This Technical Note and the attached drawings, including the staggered parking restriction idea shown on drawing 0415-016, have been produced for distribution to all households in Elmlea and Rylestone Grove to aid their further consideration of the options.

4.4. For the proposals to be taken forward by BCC, support from the vast majority of households on the two roads will be required for a single option.

4.5. The BCC officer responsible for dealing with promotion of TROs is the Area Manager – Highways, Mr Mark Sperduty, who can be contacted by telephone on 0117 903 6448 or 07887 451728, or by email at Mark.Sperduty@bristol.gov.uk.

4.6. Experience of introducing parking restrictions proposed on the south side of Shaplands in 2013/14 revealed that, if there is not a significant level of support for a waiting restriction scheme, BCC will not consider it for implementation. So a co-ordinated response on behalf of residents wishing to promote a particular scheme is strongly recommended.

5. Residents’ Parking Scheme

5.1. If a suitable scheme of waiting restrictions cannot be agreed upon then the only remaining option for controlling long-stay parking on Elmlea and Rylestone Grove would be to seek the introduction of a Residents Parking Scheme (RPS). Vehicles would then be required to display a permit in order to park legally on these roads, and the local authority would be able to decide which addresses in the area are eligible for a permit. Residents would need to make an annual payment for the permit, which covers the cost of running the scheme.

5.2. BCC have recently completed the introduction of 15 RPSs across the city, and it is unlikely that further schemes will be considered until after local council and mayoral elections in May 2016. During the roll-out of the new schemes it was suggested that it was likely to take at least 12 months for a scheme to be developed and 18 months before a scheme could be implemented. Given the forthcoming local elections these timescales may be optimistic. However, the recent
introduction of waiting restrictions across the Clifton and Durdham Downs is likely to have
displaced commuter parking onto the residential roads of Stoke Bishop, which may lead to a
review of parking issues in this area being undertaken as a priority.

5.3. In discussions regarding Shaplands, BCC advised that they do not have an RPS on an
individual street and the Mayor’s requirement that an RPS should pay for itself means that any
scheme would have to cover a wider area than just Shaplands. The same logic would
presumably apply to Elmlea and Rylestone Grove, so if residents consider this to be a preferred
way forward, collaborative working with residents of nearby streets may be beneficial.

5.4. If local residents wish to see a RPS implemented, it would be a matter for residents to take up
with BCC direct.

6. Summary and Recommendation

6.1. The 2015 parking surveys suggested that some of the cars parked on Elmlea at the Patty’s
Lane end may belong to UoB students. The results for Rylestone Grove were less clear.

6.2. Residents advise that cars parked legally on the section of Elmlea closest to its junction with
Parry’s Lane, can cause congestion at busy times, which can lead to problems of highway
safety. KTC consider that this is the only significant highway safety issue that has been raised
by residents that may be affected by student parking.

6.3. To address the highway safety concern, KTC recommend that residents make representations
to BCC that the proposals shown in Option 1 (attached) are introduced, comprising extension of
double yellow lines on Elmlea further away from its junction with Parry’s Lane.

6.4. As these changes would be introduced in order to improve safety and do not include the
introduction of unusual waiting restrictions it is considered likely that BCC would support the
implementation of these parking restrictions without requiring such strong majority support of
local residents.

6.5. A waiting restriction scheme involving staggered single hours of restriction on opposite sides of
the roads was proposed by residents at a meeting in September 2015. An illustrative layout for
such a scheme has been prepared and shown on drawing 0415-016 attached. KTC consider
the scheme to be highly unusual and, on the basis of advice from BCC on a similar one hour
restriction proposed on Shaplands, would not expect BCC to be prepared to promote the
scheme.

6.6. Some residents favour the introduction of a RPS on Elmlea and Rylestone Grove. This is not a
matter significantly affected by UoB student parking. However, if a majority support an RPS,
residents are advised to work with residents of nearby streets to lobby for its introduction.
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**Elmlea and Rylestone Grove - Residents Parking Survey Example**

This survey example has been prepared by Key Transport Consultants Ltd to assist the residents of Elmlea and Rylestone Grove who will be required to collect evidence of near unanimous support for the introduction of parking restrictions along these two roads in order to pursued Bristol City Council to consider the proposals.

The survey will need to be provided to all of the residents living along the affected areas of Elmlea and Rylestone Grove, and a response will be required from most if not all addresses.

The information collected should only be used for the purposes of considering the introduction of parking restrictions along Elmlea and Rylestone Grove. Data should be stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and should not be passed to any third parties parties.

Please provide some information about yourself so that the organisers of the survey can confirm that they have received responses from all properties along Elmlea and Rylestone Grove, and provide you with feedback on the findings of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>House No</th>
<th>Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you be happy to receive updates by email with regards to the feedback from the survey and any future discussions with Bristol City Council?

**Question 1:**
Do you agree that steps need to be taken to reduce the level of on-street parking on Elmlea and Rylestone Grove?

- Yes
- No

**Question 2:**
Would you support the introduction of parking and/or waiting restrictions along Elmlea and Rylestone Grove in order to control on-street parking, and in particular long stay on-street parking by students and commuters?

- Yes
- No

**Question 3:**
Having considered the information provided by the University in their Consultants Technical Note and the parking, waiting and movement restrictions proposed in the six options provided please select which is your preferred option for dealing with on-street parking issues? (Please select only one option)

- Option 1 - drawing 0415-011
- Option 2 - drawing 0415-012
- Option 3 - drawing 0415-013
- Option 4 - drawing 0415-014
- Option 5 - drawing 0415-015
- Option 6 - drawing 0415-016
- None of the above

**Question 4:**
Would you support the introduction of a residents parking scheme in Stoke Bishop incorporating Elmlea and Rylestone Grove, similar to schemes introduced across Bristol, limiting on-street parking to permit holders and their visitors?

- Yes
- No

**Question 5:**
If you would like to see any alterations made to your preferred parking restriction option or if you have any other comments relating to on-street parking along Elmlea and Rylestone Grove, or wish to highlight a particular location where poor / inconsiderate parking regularly causes issues please let us know in the space below.
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