

Transport & Health

# THSG

Science Group

## **RESPONSE BY THE TRANSPORT AND HEALTH SCIENCE GROUP TO THE CONSULTATION ON PAVEMENT PARKING**

The Transport and Health Science Group (THSG) is a UK-based international independent scientific society of public health and transport practitioners and researchers committed to understanding and addressing the links between transport policies and health and promoting a healthy transport system. It is one of two such societies internationally and, in the UK, it also acts as the agent for the other, the North American based International Professional Association for Transport and Health. We also administer the Transport Special Interest Group of the Faculty of Public Health of the Royal Colleges of Physicians of the United Kingdom.

### Introductory Questions

Question 1

For contact purposes only:

- Your name  
**Stephen Watkins**
- Your email  
**thsgchair@gmail.com**

Question 2

Are you responding as:

- an individual?
- on behalf of an organisation?  
**On behalf of an organisation but I have answered questions 3 to 5 as an individual**

## Questions for individuals

### Question 3

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

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

**Yes**

### Question 4

Pavement parking causes you problems because:

- you have a sight impairment
- you have a mobility impairment
- you use a buggy or pram to transport children
- another issue

**I use a shopping trolley. Also cars sometimes allow insufficient space even for an ordinary pedestrian**

### Question 5

Would you leave home more often if there was no pavement parking?

- Yes
- No

**No but I find it unsafe to be forced into the road.**

## Questions for all respondents

### Question 6

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

- Yes

- No
- Don't know

**We are a national organisation so do not have “an area” but our members tell us this is a serious problem in many areas.**

#### Question 7

Do you prefer:

- option 1?
- option 2?
- option 3?
- an alternative option? (please describe it)

**Option 2 could be introduced immediately and then there should be a three-year preparatory period for replacing it with option 3. This would allow local authorities to identify roads where option 3 is not appropriate and on those roads option 2 would continue to apply (together with any more specific regulations made at the specific site).**

**A 15-mph speed limit should apply at any point where local authorities decide to allow pavement parking, unless the restrictions applied are such as to prevent obstruction of the footway (for example where parking is permitted on only part of a wide pavement).**

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'?

**An obstruction should be regarded as unnecessary if the vehicle could not have been parked without causing an obstruction either to the pavement or to the carriageway AND there is no alternative parking within a reasonable distance.**

**It is important to note that there may be situations where parking on the pavement is necessary but obstruction of the pavement is not. An example would be a wide pavement where only a small encroachment is necessary, leaving ample room for wheelchairs, prams and buggies. It is important therefore that the definition should not be expressed solely in terms of the need to park on the pavement but must refer to the need to obstruct it.**

**Our additional proviso about absence of alternative parking is important – we should not assume that there is a right to park at any point on a road.**

**The term “reasonable distance” might be applied differentially as between blue badge holders and others.**

**On the question of whether space for a single line or double line of traffic should be needed on the carriageway we would suggest that a double line should only be required on an A road, a B road or other roads designated by local authorities as requiring two lines of traffic. On all other streets a single line should suffice.**

#### 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

**No strong opinion. Probably yes in most cases but egregiously selfish or stupid examples should receive a ticket anyway.**

#### Question 10

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

**The advantage is the simplicity of introduction which allows it to be introduced immediately. The scope for dispute about what is “necessary” is the main disadvantage. The other disadvantage is**

**that it would assume pavement parking to be “necessary” in all places where the road isn’t wide enough but, in some cases, the local authority might have decided that parking at that point is not needed.**

### 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)

**All public roads (but see our answer to Q12). It is absurd to suggest that where there has been recognised to be the need for a pavement on a high-speed road it should be acceptable to force people into the path of high-speed traffic**

#### Question 12

Should a national prohibition apply to:

- pavements only?
- pavements and verges?

**On roads with a speed limit of up to 40mph it should apply to pavements and verges.**

**On rural roads with speed limits above 40mph it should apply to pavements only.**

### Question 13

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

**It depends on how complicated is the signage for permitting parking on the pavement. We do not want to clutter the environment with signs. But simple pavement markings should suffice.**

### 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?

**The advantage of option 3 is that the potential for argument about whether or not obstruction is “necessary” is replaced by the exercise of local authority decision-making which is clearer and more capable of adjustment to the needs of individual areas. The drawback is that this would take time and that it would open the process to political manipulation.**

### Question 15

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

#### Option 2

**There would be a beneficial impact from the encouragement of walking and cycling.**

### Option 3

**There would be a beneficial impact from the encouragement of walking and cycling but a negative impact from additional signage (however see our answer to Q12)**

### 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?

**If option 3 is introduced then blue badge holders should be exempt, but only to the extent that they should be governed instead by option 2**

## 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.

**Preventing pavement parking has beneficial impacts for disabled people, for parents and for people who do not use cars (which affects women more than men.**

**Introducing option 3 without any special provision for blue badge holders would have a negative impact on disabled people. We proposed a way to avoid this in our answer to Q16.**

## Final comments for all respondents

### Question 18

Do you have any other comments?

- 1. This is a vitally important reform.**
- 2. The consultation has not considered the position of “living streets”. This is a serious omission as we believe living streets should be encouraged. In a living street there is no distinction between the footway and the carriageway and the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles is resolved by slowing vehicles through creating obstacles including the use of street furniture and parking bays. Parking of vehicles is regulated by the provision of designated spaces which are arranged as part of the system of obstacles. Option 2 should apply in living streets with the whole street being regarded as footway**

## Questions for organisations (other than local authorities)

### Question 19

Your organisation’s name is?

**Transport and Health Science Group**



### Question 20

Is your organisation a commercial business?

- Yes
- No

**No**

### Question 21

Does your organisation routinely make deliveries as part of its business?

- Yes
- No

**n/a**

### Question 22

Do you agree that 20 minutes of pavement parking would be adequate for a delivery?

- Yes
- No

**Yes**

If you answered "No", why not?

### Question 23

If you answered "No", of all the daily deliveries that you may make, what percentage do you think will take longer than 20 minutes each to be completed?

**n/a**

## Question 24

In your opinion, what types of delivery that you make would require greater than 20 minutes?

**n/a**