APPENDIX D

2.1 Consultation stages involved in preparing a CPZ

2.2 The length of the process for investigating and designing a CPZ is heavily influenced by the extent of consultation undertaken. A summary of the typical stages involved is shown in Appendix E.

APPENDIX E

STAGES INVOLVED IN PREPARING A CPZ

NB - *This is a simplified model approach, for illustrative purposes, assuming no complications.*

There is an annual review of priorities and agreement of work programme. All petitions and requests received during the year are considered at this meeting. Once the principle of investigating a CPZ is agreed, the following stages are typically involved:

a) Define study area - including consideration of area(s) that are likely to receive displaced parking.

b) Stage 1 Consultation - stakeholder meeting to discuss study area and clarify issues, problems and policy framework.

c) Agree boundary and scheme principles with the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP)/Portfolio Holder(PH).

d) Stage 2 Consultation - do people want a CPZ/resident permit scheme or not? Only proceed with majority support. Consultation is normally by delivery of consultation documents with a reply paid facility in addition to the ability to complete online. Exhibitions are held within or as close as possible to consultations areas depending on the size and complexity of the scheme. In all cases consultation material is displayed at the Civic Centre and contact details are added to all consultation material to enable further information or clarification to be provided on request.

e) Analyse results and determine area to go forward to detail design - agreement by TARSAP/PH if necessary ie. if contentious or uncertain. Double yellow line proposals and junctions, bends and other areas of restriction for safety reasons will be taken forward separately. They will not be subject to consultation on whether to proceed or not but will be subject to comments from local people about length etc.

f) Detail design of selected area.

g) Stage 3 Consultation - on detail design.

h) Amend design in light of consultation and agree “final” design (via TARSAP/PH if contentious or uncertain). The objective is to provide a best fit on a road or part road basis to meet the majority view of those who support the proposals and those who do not

i) Draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

j) Consult Police on TRO (statutory).

k) Circulate leaflet to all those consulted with results or how to access results if large content and showing proposals to be taken to statutory consultation-leaflet timed to coincide with statutory consultation stage 4.

l) Stage 4 Consultation - Advertise TRO (statutory).

m) Consider objections to TRO (statutory) - TARSAP/PH.

n) Agree final scheme (can be concurrent with previous stage).

o) Prepare detailed drawings for manufacturers and contractors and arrange procurement.

p) Implement and “make” TRO.

q) Review within 12 months, subject to demand. These reviews will focus on relatively small scale changes looking at changes to lengths of yellow lines, residents bays and extension or removal of sections of the CPZ. Major changes such as variations to CPZ operational days and hours of control are outside the scope of these reviews and will be reported to the Panel for consideration.

r) Further reviews subject to workload prioritisation.

s) All aspects of consultation, collation, analysis and reporting of results will be subject to the Quality Assurance (QA) procedures established in September 2009

Notes

Where there is a high degree of confidence about the design of a scheme for a particular area, one or more of the first three stages of consultation can be omitted. However, this is often not the case and the process is therefore designed to interact with the community at frequent intervals, to ensure that as far as possible the design reflects the wishes of the local community. The reason for this incremental approach is that experience has shown that it is very difficult to achieve a consensus about the design of CPZs. It is therefore almost inevitable that people will object to proposals. It would be very difficult for the Council to deal with these objections if it were not able to demonstrate knowledge of the wider community’s views.

If objections are upheld it can mean redesign, and possibly re-consultation, which of course increases costs and the length of the programme. In other words, taking short-cuts can be counter-productive and should therefore only be considered where there is confidence about the design being in harmony with the wishes of the local community.