

Department for Transport Pavement Parking Review

Question 6

Do you think vehicles parked on the pavement is a problem in your area?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Question 7

Do you prefer:

- option 1?
- option 2?
- option 3? (Nationwide ban on pavement parking, as in London, unless explicitly permitted by local council)
- an alternative option? (please describe it)

Questions regarding Option 2 - to allow local authorities with CPE powers to enforce against 'Unnecessary obstruction of the pavement'

Question 8

How would you define an 'unnecessary obstruction of the pavement'?

A vehicle which is obstructing part or all of the pavement, unless:

- 1. The vehicle is carrying emergency personnel or equipment which are needed at that location;*
- 2. The location is the only safe place for a Disabled driver to park, disembark, and reach their final destination.*

Question 9

Do you think a warning notice should be given for first-time offences of causing an unnecessary obstruction by parking on the pavement?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Question 10

What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages associated with Option 2?

Option 2 would be exceptionally hard to enforce, firstly due to the lack of clarity over 'unnecessary obstruction', and secondly due to the need for it to be enforced by council

officials policing the area. This would either require a considerable increase in the number of officials on the streets, or an increase in traffic cameras. These would be particularly difficult to introduce in residential or rural areas, despite the fact that it is in residential areas where narrower pavements, lack of existing parking restrictions, and higher level of short pedestrian trips makes pavement parking more of a problem.

Questions regarding Option 3 - England-wide pavement parking prohibition

Question 11

Do you think a national prohibition should apply:

- on no roads (since you are against the proposal)?
- on all public roads within the country?
- only on roads with speed limits up to 40mph (this includes roads in villages, towns and cities); or
- in an alternative way of your description? (please describe)

Question 12

Should a national prohibition apply to:

- pavements only?
- pavements and verges?

Question 13

What are your views on the impact this would have on the built and historic environment?

Reducing pavement parking will improve pedestrian access to the built and historic environment, especially for Disabled people & parents walking with small children. This law must be accompanied by

- *Policies and investment to make non-motorised transport more convenient, safer and more attractive than driving. This has to include fully inclusive cycle hire schemes in cities but also in towns and in rural areas (providing access to bicycles but also cargo bikes and other non-standard cycles and e-assist options on all cycles) and good provision of cycle parking for all types of cycles.*
- *Prioritisation of car parking into a) accessible car parking for Disabled drivers and b) short term parking for key workers*
- *Increased accessibility of walking/wheeling places*
- *Increased provision of Park & Ride / Park & Bike facilities on edges of towns/cities*
- *Logistics consolidation hubs on edge of towns/cities and regional hubs in rural areas with cycle last miles deliveries*

Question 14

What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of Option 3:

- for rural areas including villages?
- for suburban areas?
- for town and city centres?
- Overall?

Removing pavement parking will help keep pavements clear and in good condition, making them easier for pedestrians to use, particularly wheelchair users, families with pushchairs, visually impaired people, or those with mobility impairments, for whom cracked/broken pavement surfaces or obstacles make them harder to navigate. Reducing parking opportunities may also encourage a move away from cars towards more active forms of transport, especially for shorter journeys, and reduce congestion caused by pavement parking in narrow roads.

However, this may create problems in areas without alternative on-road parking (often residential areas), particularly for those more reliant on car journeys (for example, Disabled/less mobile individuals unable to cycle/wheel/use a mobility scooter, or carers).

This law must be accompanied by

- *Policies and investment to make non-motorised transport more convenient, safer and more attractive than driving. This has to include fully inclusive cycle hire schemes in cities but also in towns and in rural areas (providing access to bicycles but also cargo bikes and other non-standard cycles and e-assist options on all cycles) and good provision of cycle parking for all types of cycles.*
- *Prioritisation of car parking into a) accessible car parking for Disabled drivers and b) short term parking for key workers*
- *Increased accessibility of walking/wheeling places*
- *Increased provision of Park & Ride / Park & Bike facilities on edges of towns/cities*
- *Logistics consolidation hubs on edge of towns/cities and regional hubs in rural areas with cycle last miles deliveries*
- *End to pavement parking must be accompanied with stringent 20mph speed limits enforcement, especially through villages.*

Question 15

Do you believe Option 2 or Option 3 would have an impact on the environment?

Option 2

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Option 3

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If answering "Yes" to an option, please explain the impact you think will occur and whether it is positive or negative.

Reducing parking opportunities may encourage people to switch from private vehicles to active forms of transport/public transport for shorter journeys, which may in turn reduce traffic and congestion, benefiting the environment in the long term. As Option 3 has the greater level of restriction on parking, it is likely to have a greater impact.

Question 16

For both options 2 and 3, we propose exceptions for those vehicles listed in Annex B. (The final listed exception applies to option 3 only.)

- What, if any, other additional vehicles or services would you like to exempt and why?

In areas with limited on-road parking, it may be necessary to give some individuals with mobility impairments and/or carers licences/permits for pavement parking.

Questions on the equality duty

Question 17

In respect of people who share any of the following protected characteristics:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- pregnancy and maternity
- race
- religion/belief
- sex
- sexual orientation

Please describe any negative impacts that the options in this document might have on these objectives:

- eliminating discrimination
- advancing equality of opportunity
- fostering good relations

Please clearly identify the specific consultation option, the protected characteristic affected, which objective is affected and the nature of any negative impact.

Options 2 and 3 may have a negative impact if restrictions on parking meant that those with mobility impairments who are reliant on private vehicles and/or carers are unable to park within a suitable distance from their residence. This impact could be mitigated by providing pavement parking permits for these individuals.

Final comments for all respondents

Question 18

Do you have any other comments?

Option 3, with permits for certain individuals, is the most effective option in terms of increasing equality, safety, encouraging active travel/public transport over private car use, and maintaining the visual appearance of an area. Obstructions on the pavement and damage to the pavement surface make it harder for Disabled people, elderly people, and families to navigate the pavement, as indicated by the DfT research prior to this consultation.

Conversely, the presumed access to parking and difficulties navigating cluttered or damaged pavements encourage the use of private cars over more sustainable and socially-beneficial active travel and/or public transport. Removing pavement parking (with subsequent reductions in traffic, especially when combined with low traffic neighbourhoods) will make the streetscape more accessible, safer, cleaner, and more pleasant for everyone.

Option 3 is preferable to Option 2: the ambiguities and lack of clarity of Option 2 will make it difficult and costly to enforce, reducing its effectiveness. The more complicated legislative process to introduce Option 3 is outweighed by the clarity for drivers and the ease of enforcement.