

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF CAR PARKING CHARGES AT SUTTON PARK

Questions and Answers from Teams Webinar Session Held on 26 August 2025

Pay and Display (P&D) machines

Q) How reliable are solar powered machines and will they have mains power back up?

A) Solar powered P&D machines are used at Cannon Hill Park without issue (solar powered machines are also widely used at National Trust sites). Spare batteries will be purchased and swapped as and when required. The P&D machines will not have mains power back up as this will require significant landscaping works and project cost.

Q) How will contactless payments and App usage work in areas of the Park where there is no WiFi/mobile phone coverage?

A) Where there is limited phone signal machines will be fitted with dual sim to ensure signal strength. With RingGo, there is no need to be alongside a meter for a signal to be found/parking session to be paid for.

Q) What model Flowbird machines are being proposed?

A) Subject to the outcome of the consultation, a procurement exercise will be undertaken. As such no decision has yet been made on the make/model of the P&D machines.

Q) What measures are being considered to prevent vandalism or coin removal from machines late at night and what basis have you concluded risk of vandalism is low? (BCC Cabinet Report May 2025)

A) The machines to be purchased will meet BS EN 12414:2020 and minimum-security standard of class P4 with regard to protection against burglary or theft. These standards are used across the Council's Pay & Display machine portfolio (both on-street and off-street) without incident. The addition of cashless payment options (plus RingGo) will reduce the amount of cash onsite.

Q) What will you do to help protect residents from scams?

A) Instructions will be passed to the cash collection team, Park Rangers and grounds maintenance team to regularly check the P&D machines for fraudulent stickers/objects out of place attached to the machines.

Q) Will we have an alternative to using an app? It is discriminatory and there's plenty of evidence of such tech failing and people getting fines despite having paid.

- A)** RingGo is utilised across the Council's car parks around the city without issue. The RingGo payment method offers a payment by phone option, in addition to the app payment, as mentioned, the proposed Pay & Display machines will be installed at car parks throughout the park and will accept coin and card payments.
- Q)** **Where will the proposed machines be located? And once visitors have parked somewhere in the Park how far could they potentially have to walk to access a P&D machine given that there will only be one machine for every 68 acres of the Park?**
- A)** There are plans to install 26 P&D machines around the car parks, which are largely located around the perimeter of the park. Most car parks will have more than one machine to accommodate for faults; if a fault does occur with a machine it will be a short walk/drive to the nearest machine. RingGo payment options (app or phone) will also be offered throughout the park, as an alternative means of payment in case of machine fault.
- Q)** **You have previously stated that 'the 31 coin only Pay and Display Machines may need to be retrofitted with cashless payment options post-implementation' (BCC Cabinet Report May 2025). The revised plans now suggest that cashless payment and payment via App will be available at all machines from day one of installation. Is this correct?**
- A)** We are currently working with our finance partners to set up cashless payment options for the proposed scheme. It is hoped this will be in place in time for implementation. Our fallback option is to retrofit the machines if necessary. The RingGo payment option (app and phone) will be available from implementation, however.
- Q)** **Will visitors with disabilities who don't have Blue Badges be granted free parking in the Park? It is estimated that Blue Badge holders only account for about 15% of people with this protected characteristic. Are you aware that your policy potentially ignores many more people with long-term physical or mental health conditions who currently enjoy free access to the Park?**
- A)** Following changes to the regulations and guidance to local authorities on the issuing of blue badges in 2019, the eligibility criteria for the blue badge scheme was extended to include hidden or non-visible disabilities.
- Our approach for disabled parking mirrors that of the Corporate disabled parking policy i.e. Blue Badge holders that display a valid badge will be exempt from parking. Visitors are welcome to apply for a Blue Badge to benefit from the exemption from parking charges. Consideration has been given to ensure sufficient disabled/accessible parking bays are installed for the scheme in line with government guidelines and installed signage will meet the legislative requirements for ease of visibility.

Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and parking restrictions

- Q)** **How will the proposed car parking charge compliance be enforced?**
- A)** The Council has a contract with NSL for citywide parking enforcement. It is proposed NSL will be instructed to enforce the car parks (and roads surrounding the park) when the scheme is

due to go-live. The matter of additional enforcement resources to complete this work has been identified, and discussions are ongoing with colleagues in the Parking/Enforcement Team on this matter.

Q) How can you possibly fund further enforcement when there is no enforcement in number of locations in Sutton such as Mere Green, Jevons Road and Markham Road? New Oscott Primary School is close to Banners Gate and roads there will likely be affected by displaced parking

A) The Council has a contract with NSL for citywide parking enforcement. Income from Penalty Charge Notices is retained by BCC; BCC then pay for the cost of the deployment of NSL's enforcement officers. For reference, the income from any Penalty Charge Notices is retained by the BCC Highways team as this helps to offset the cost of enforcement, with net surplus income from Penalty Charge Notices to be used for Highways related matters only in line with legislative requirements.

A phased approach to parking restrictions is proposed, with the first phase to focus on existing parking hotspots and be introduced in advance of the proposed charging scheme. The second phase of restrictions will follow, post-implementation, based on resident feedback.

Q) How are you going to stop people park along the side of the road within the Park and causing traffic jam? How will they know they have to pay and what signage will be used?

A) The proposed scheme designs strive to minimise the possible urbanisation of the park whilst balancing the requirements for an enforceable parking scheme e.g. the use of double lines will be minimised, signage to be installed on wooden posts where possible, repeater/reminder signs along the carriageway (as opposed to double yellow line marking). The repeater/reminder signs will remind individuals of the requirement to pay for parking and be located at positions along the carriageway in agreement with the project engineer.

Q) How many repeater signs do you think will be needed and aren't you worried this will be an eyesore in the Park?

A) The number and location of the repeater/reminder signs will be agreed with the project engineer to comply with the appropriate legislation and will be installed along the carriageways between the gates and the car parks. It is proposed the signage will be installed on wooden posts where possible to minimize the visual impact.

Q) What SLA will parks have to ensure regular daily visits to the park and surrounding roads?

A) The Council's Enforcement Team manage the NSL contract and distribution and frequency of NSL's enforcement officers across the city. Adherence to the enforcement schedule will be monitored by the Enforcement Team.

- Q) How will you prevent people from parking on the grass verge on Monmouth Drive and destroying the grass etc? Enforcement of parking restrictions will not necessarily prevent people from driving onto the grass verge.**
- A)** As part of the first phase of parking restrictions (focusing on existing parking hotspots) we are currently considering the introduction of double yellow lines are considered in discussion with Highways Engineer for Monmouth Drive (in the vicinity of Banners Gate). The effectiveness of the restrictions will be monitored post-implementation and if unauthorised parking continues further options will be explored as part of phase two restrictions.
- Q) Please don't put double yellows across the railway bridge near Bistro car park. Try placing heavy logs or something.**
- A)** Your suggestion will be considered as part of the scheme designs. It should be noted the railway bridge has weight restrictions and therefore the placement of heavy logs is not advised.
- Q) What cost has been allowed for NSL covering the Four Oaks Estate to ticket anyone? It is a private estate and will be vulnerable with displaced parking. I just can't see that it can work over such a large area. It'd cost a fortune. Canon Hill park is in a much more urban context. You're not recognising the specific character of Sutton Park NNR and its context. How do you intend to instal TRO and continue to maintain them on this private land?**
- A)** We acknowledge there is a risk of displacement parking at Hartopp Gate (Four Oaks Estate), but it is felt any restrictions would follow as part of the second phase i.e. based on resident feedback. If residents are experiencing displacement parking post-implementation, we will open discussions with the landowner to progress such restrictions. The proposed scheme will need time to "bed in" so that we do not rush into permanent parking restrictions which will inconvenience residents unnecessarily.
- Q) Miller & Carter car park is public land; how can you introduce ANPR here?**
- A)** At their request, we are currently in discussions with Miller & Carter for a possible licence/lease extension to include the car park. It is proposed this legal work will be completed prior to implementation to enable Miller & Carter to introduce an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) scheme for the car park in question.
- Q) The budget for fees for Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) in your proposals is only £75,000 (BCC Cabinet Report May 2025). What will this budget be used for and is this applicable solely for the TRO measures within the Park?**
- A)** The budget for TROs covers the preparation, advertisement etc of the required legal papers for the Parking Places Order (within the park) and for the TRO that will cover the first phase of parking restrictions (external to the park). In addition, it will cover the lining and signing of roads identified for the first phase of restrictions. Funds to cover the second phase of parking restrictions will be funded from car park revenue.
- Q) How many 'frontages' have received formal consultation letters from you? Some residents living within 50m of the 20 pedestrian gates into the park have still not received letters from the Council.**

A) Following discussions with Highways colleagues, it was agreed to hand deliver approximately 550 resident letters to properties within a 50m of pedestrian gates and 100m of the vehicular gates to the park. The advice from Highways colleagues meant residents without existing restrictions in front of their properties were prioritised. It can be noted the resident letter provides no more information than the information available within the park i.e. the site Notices. Subject to the outcome of this consultation, a separate letter drop will be completed for impacted residents as part of the consultation on the first phase of parking restrictions.

Q) Where are the existing parking 'hot spots' you have identified as the primary focus areas for the first phase of parking restrictions pre-implementation?

A) The roads identified are:

- Clifton Road, for Town Gate
- Stonehouse Road, for Boldmere Gate
- Monmouth Drive and Jevons Road, for Banners Gate.

Q) Have you considered the impact of displaced parking at Wyndley Leisure Centre and how it will adversely affect volunteers and users of facilities at this location?

A) We are in ongoing discussions with Birmingham Community Leisure Trust who operate Wyndley Leisure Centre and Baths. We are aware that they are looking to introduce an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) system and that there is no intention to charge users of the leisure centre or swimming pool for parking, as they already pay fees to access those facilities. In our discussions to date we have agreed to time the introduction of the ANPR scheme to mirror the start of the charges at the park (subject to the outcome of this consultation).

Q) What is the budget for TROs on roads outside the Park? Please split the budget figure between pre-implementation (already identified as parking 'hot spots') and post-implementation

A) The budget for TROs covers the preparation, advertisement etc of the required legal papers for the Parking Places Order and for the TRO that will cover the first phase of parking restrictions. In addition, it will cover the lining and signing of roads identified for the first phase of restrictions. As phase two parking restrictions will be determined by resident feedback post-implementation, a budget figure cannot be set. Phase two parking restrictions for phase two will be funded from car park revenue.

Q) Are you aware that Highways officers estimated that the cost for TROs outside the Park would be at least £500k when previous parking charge proposals have been brought forward?

A) The quoted figure was based on an incorrect assumption from a contracted Highways engineer at the time i.e. that all roads surrounding the park within a 50 metre radius of the park's boundary would be subject to parking restrictions. This figure was never agreed nor was the aforementioned extent of restrictions.

Q) Why did you not investigate TRO requirements for roads outside the Park or allow a budget for these measures within your estimated £641,159 capital costs and before announcing your plans?

A) TRO requirements for parking restrictions are included in the £641k capital costs. To be clear, there is a requirement to seek approval for the proposed parking charges (stage one) before then consulting on any proposed parking restrictions (and confirming the extent of said restrictions) (stage two). The scheme will need time to “bed in” so that we do not rush into permanent parking restrictions which will inconvenience residents unnecessarily.

Q) In your previous proposals for car parking charges (September 2022) you estimated that capital costs for the scheme would be £1,126,203. This time round your capital costs estimate is £641,159. The key difference is that three years ago you budgeted around £565,000 in your costs for 'landscaping, car park and carriageway works' but you have not allowed for any such costs in your latest proposals. Why?

A) Since the original capital costs were tabled, a different approach has been decided upon, where significant landscaping works e.g. carriageway and car park surface repairs etc, will take place post-implementation using car park revenue. Some carriageway repairs have been completed already, whilst the project budget allows for targeted repairs prior to implementation. This approach reduces the capital requirements for the scheme.

Q) Are you liaising with Walsall Council whose residents could also be impacted by displaced parking (off Streetly Lane) and what stage are your discussions at?

A) I can confirm Walsall District Council, Lichfield Borough Council and Staffordshire County Council have been made aware of the proposals and consultation. As part of this notification, we explained the planned approach for restrictions i.e. first phase to focus on known parking hotspots prior to implementation (i.e. Birmingham roads), with the second phase of restrictions to follow post-implementation following resident feedback. If roads within their boundaries as a traffic authority are under consideration for parking restrictions, then we will consult/engage with them directly at that point. Each authority replied to say they have no issues at this stage of the process.

Q) In Attfield v Barnet, the High Court quashed Barnet Council’s decision to set parking charges with the stated purpose of raising surplus revenue for road maintenance and other transport costs. Mrs Justice Lang held that the council had acted for an unauthorised purpose and beyond its statutory powers. Can you comment on this please as far as the park is concerned.

The proposals are unlawful under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTA 1984), as confirmed by the binding precedent in R (Attfield) v London Borough of Barnet [2013] EWHC 2089 (Admin).

A) The quoted case (Attfield v Barnet) related to the introduction of on-street parking charges; our proposal is for an off-street parking places scheme. There is a distinction between parking charges derived from on and off-street parking respectively.

Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984 requires that for authorities outside London, they must keep an account of their income and expenditure in respect of parking places which are '*designated parking places*' (i.e. paid parking spaces on-street). So, whilst the section 55 restrictions apply to parking charges from on-street parking, they do not extend to parking charges from off-street parking. In the case of Sutton Park the Order is being made for the purpose of relieving or preventing congestion of traffic, as set out in the Statement of Reasons. It is correct that any surplus revenue from off-street parking charges in parks will go towards the park budget, to ensure the benefits are felt by all, but this is in line with the RTRA 1984.

Q) The proposals conflict with Birmingham City Council's own "Creating an Active Birmingham Strategy 2024–2034", by creating new financial barriers to accessing green space, disproportionately affecting disadvantaged groups and undermining public health.

A) We recognise and fully support the importance of encouraging people to be active for their physical and mental health. The introduction of parking charges is not intended to discourage exercise or reduce access to the park. Income from parking will be reinvested directly into maintaining and improving the park's facilities, paths, trails, and habitats, ensuring it remains a safe, attractive, and welcoming place for all visitors.

Access to the park remains free – charges are not to use the park but only to park a vehicle. Hence, those travelling on foot, bicycle or by public transport would not be charged. Sutton Park is served by both bus and train, with bus stops at various points around the perimeter of the park (close to pedestrian or vehicular gates).

For those who travel by car, parking charges help ensure that the costs of maintaining the site are shared fairly, rather than falling entirely on general council tax. Our aim is to balance public health priorities with the long-term financial sustainability of the park.

The proposed charging scheme aligns with climate change and transport policies to encourage more carbon efficient forms of transport. Residents of Birmingham have a range of other park spaces local to them which can also be utilised for recreation and physical health and wellbeing. Generally, these are within a 10-15 minute walk of most households.

Parking

Q) How will the free 30 minutes free parking be policed?

A) Enforcement officers will complete an initial pass of a car park (checking for tickets/permits, ticket times etc). They will then return in 30 minutes to check if 30 minute tickets have expired.

Q) What grace period will be given if you get lost on a walk / lose your dog? If you do not pay but drive in, will you use the machine for 30 minutes?

If you opt for the 30 minute free parking period, you will need to obtain a ticket from a Pay & Display machine, or select the 30 minute option via the RingGo app. The standard grace period for enforcement purposes is 10 minutes, meaning an enforcement officer, after noticing a

ticket has expired, will wait 10 minutes before issuing a Penalty Charge Notice. The RingGo app will allow you to extend your parking session with a few clicks, if you were to get lost on your work for example.

- Q) Do you consider it acceptable to introduce charges before improving the infrastructure? Several car parks are almost dangerous to access - pot holes and poor surfaces frequently damage vehicles. Many surfaces are too rough for people with mobility issues / push chairs etc to use. The consultation material should also include the plans shared tonight.**
- A)** The park's ongoing operational budget is not sufficient to complete the required works to improve the built infrastructure (i.e. all car parks and carriageways) within the park. The capital budget for the proposed charging scheme allows for targeted repairs prior to implementation. Going forward, the scheme will generate the required revenue to correct the issues with the built infrastructure.
- Q) Why is 20 year old technology being proposed to collect charges? There are 41 places in the park that people currently park. There are six entrances that cars use to access the park. Surely a current number plate recognition system would be a cheaper to install, cheaper to run, than coin operated boxes.**
- A)** The legalities of local authorities using Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) for enforcement purposes on public land are notoriously complex, with a great deal of uncertainty over its use. We are aware of no local authorities using ANPR for car park enforcement without first converting the land to a private car park and engaging a third party operator to then manage the car park via an ANPR scheme under contract law. As Birmingham is a traffic authority this is not possible i.e. we are bound to use powers granted under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and not contract law for the introduction of a charging scheme on public land. Given Sutton Park's designations it is felt the use of Pay & Display machines, balanced with a targeted approach to minimise the urbanisation of the park, is the right approach to take, therefore.
- Q) Higher parking charges have been justified by the local demographic however locals are more likely to walk to the park. The charges will therefore mostly impact locals who are not able to walk (disabled) and visitors from further afield i.e. not the local demographic. It's not clear why we should pay more based on demographic anyway - charges should relate to running costs only.**
- A)** Those park visitors from further afield may not contribute to the upkeep of the park through local taxation, therefore this approach supports the equitable burden of the park's maintenance costs. In addition, the Leader has asked that pricing for the parking schemes takes into consideration the demographics of the local area. Disabled visitors who display a valid Blue Badge will be exempt from the parking charges.
- Q) How many car parking spaces have been identified in each area please break these down into the respective areas within the park for example Blackroot/Bracebridge**
- A)** There are 25 car parks across the park within project scope, with capacity for approximately 900-1,000 vehicles.

Q) When will you know the answer about extra resources from NSL to police schemes?

A) We are currently in discussion with the Enforcement Team regarding the required resources to effectively enforce the park and surrounding roads. The final decision on additional resources will be established subject to the outcome of this consultation.

Q) What steps are being taken to mark out the parking bays in each area? Is there a reason why you won't bay the car parks?

A) Existing car parking surfaces will require resurfacing before they can be marked for parking bays – this would require significant funding to complete in all car parks which cannot be secured at this stage. We propose to install/formalise 39 disabled bays as part of the proposed implementation of the scheme.

Q) Is there a response planned if the number of visitors to the park reduce due to the parking charges?

A) The ongoing impact of the charging scheme on visitor numbers will be monitored via visitor footfall data and parking revenue.

Q) Is it expected that cars will only be parked in designated car parks and, if so, will they, where necessary, be repaired and improved and adequate? Town Gate car park clearly inadequate). Do you anticipate restricting/stopping cars parking along the various roads in the park with associated posts containing parking restriction rules?

A) The capital budget for the proposed charging scheme allows for targeted repairs prior to implementation. Going forward, the scheme will generate the required revenue to correct the issues with the built infrastructure. Repeater/reminder signs will be installed along the park's carriageways reminding visitors that a charging scheme is in effect and advising them not to block access for other vehicles.

Q) Sutton Beekeepers have a locked gated car park which is only open for training purposes at certain times of the year. Are there plans to charge beekeepers for parking within this area?

A) It is proposed the Beekeepers will be offered permits for free parking, for use within their allotted car park only.

Q) Car parking at the small area next to Wyndley Pool - often used for the Athletics club. Is this to be pay and display too with yellow lines either side of the driveway down? Is charging at Wyndley LC being reinstated?

A) We are in ongoing discussions with Birmingham Community Leisure Trust who operate Wyndley Leisure Centre and Baths to understand their implementation plan and coordinate appropriately. We are aware that they are looking to introduce an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) system and that there is no intention to charge users of the leisure centre or swimming pool for parking, as they already pay fees to access those facilities. In our discussions to date we have agreed to time the introduction of the ANPR scheme to mirror the start of the charges at the park (subject to the outcome of this consultation). The car park adjacent to the Athletic Club will continue to be within the control of the Leisure Centre and their parking scheme will apply in this location.

- Q) Town Gate area has loads of 'on street parking'. What are you doing about this?**
- A)** A phased approach to parking restrictions is proposed, with the first phase to focus on existing parking hotspots and be introduced in advance of the proposed charging scheme. The second phase of restrictions will follow, post-implementation, based on resident feedback. Clifton Road (from the roundabout to the entrance to the Clifton Road Youth Centre) is captured within the proposals for the first phase of restrictions. Separately to this project, funding has been sourced to install wooden bollards to protect the grass verge at the roundabout with Clifton Road and Park Road.
- Q) Bracebridge Restaurant provides facilities for families in a safe happy environment. However you plan to make this area a fee-paying carpark, extremely close to eating area. The access road is a narrow single -track road with no facilities for pedestrians, which is an accident waiting to happen. Are you aware of the consequences of your actions, disregarding the safety and welfare of all visiting this restaurant?**
- A)** We have considered the movement of people within the scheme designs e.g. pedestrian access to P&D machines and will complete risk assessments for each of the car parks within the scheme (on the basis of access and movement of vehicles/pedestrians) subject to the outcome of the formal consultation. Discussions are ongoing with management of the Bracebridge regarding the car park, which serves not only the restaurant but also the wider park, as part of the stakeholder consultation for the project.
- Q) Can I get a reduction in parking for picking up all the litter I collect on a daily basis when I walk my dog! I can easily pick up a carrier bag full of litter per day. Trivial question - but we do help keep the park tidy!**
- A)** Registered volunteers (approved by the Council) who assist with the Park's upkeep on a regular basis will be issued a free parking permit. The administration of parking permits to registered volunteers will be strictly controlled by the Parks' Ranger Service to prevent abuse.
- Q) If I purchased a yearly pass could I transfer this between my wife's car and my own as I use both cars on occasions to visit the park?**
- A)** Annual season tickets are linked to a vehicle's registration upon purchase, therefore are non-transferrable between vehicles.
- Q) How will user parking be protected at Clifton Road Youth Centre which is a separate entity from displaced parking from the park. I asked about Clifton Road Youth centre next to the park which is not part of Wyndley. So what help will be given to helping the youth centre were parking will be free for displaced cars? Please advise thanks**
- A)** Discussions will take place with the Youth Centre to establish a workable solution for their car park.
- Q) Who is responsible for damage to vehicles incurred while visiting the park and paying to park?**
- A)** If the proposed charge scheme progresses, the current position for vehicles parking within the park (and at other Council owned car parks across the city) will still apply i.e. visitors who park in Sutton Park do so at their own risk and the Council will not be responsible for any damage to their vehicles.

- Q) What are the expected impacts that the parking charges will have on visitor numbers? Numbers visiting the park will obviously decrease especially for families, dog walkers. People who go into the park every day will not be able to afford the costs every day.**
- A)** The projected financial modelling for the scheme considers a possible 10% decrease in visitor numbers. It is felt the combination of reduced parking rates and effective parking restrictions (across two phases) will help minimise the reduction in park visitors, however. In addition, the offer of an annual season ticket and a chargeable period of 9am to 6pm, will mean visitors can access the park for free outside of the chargeable period which will be of benefit in the summer months.
- Q) I used to be one of those people stood at a gate, collecting money. It worked. We're looking at years before this new scheme generates any money for the park so the argument that people on gates didn't raise money seems irrelevant. It paid council staff double time - if you employ people for 'normal' wage then you could probably make money.**
- A)** The scheme referenced only ever broke even i.e. it covered staff costs but provided no surplus revenue to reinvest in the park. In addition, the scheme only covered Sundays and Bank Holidays between May and September each year (until it ended in 2019). The proposed charging scheme needs to operate 7 days a week and therefore if staff were placed on gates to collect entrance income again such a scheme would require more staff to provide rota cover etc.
- Q) Plastic eco grid = plastic pollution. The gravel/stone fill at Boldmere Gate is scattered all over the place. Machines and signage = landscape and visual impacts. It's not acceptable to make 'disturbed areas' worse.**
- A)** In preparation for the B2022 Games, Boldmere Gate car park was resurfaced with recycled plastic material 'Ecogrid'. This material is used at number of sensitive sites as it provides a porous surface while still providing a hard car park surface. Stone used to fill Ecogrid cells settles over time and will provide a stable base for the car park. New machines and signage will be installed at already disturbed areas. We will try to keep the number of signs to minimum while complying with the legal requirements. We will also use existing posts on site where we can.
- Q) Bracebridge car park and number 3 are on the road and there are wild ponies over that side, so increased parking is dangerous.**
- A)** The scheme designs include no changes to the current parking provision and hence there is no increase in risk.
- Q) What is happening on Midland Road? You can currently park at the end and access the park through Midland Gate. This is the East side of the park near Tudor hill. I can guarantee that there will be displacement parking on Midland Road. Have those involved in the consultation and designs actually been to Sutton Park and the surrounding area?**
- A)** Midland Road is owned by Network Rail and therefore falls outside project scope. The position will be kept under review and discussions will take place with Network Rail if required in future.
- Q) I think you said earlier that Sutton Park is well served by public transport. I've just checked on NX West Midlands and to get from my house to Streetly Gate by bus would take half an**

- hour and involve a walk of over a mile. It's about 5 minutes by car and then I can get further into the park before I start walking. There are very few bus routes that pass the park gates.**
- A)** In addition to the 6 vehicular gates, the park can be accessed via one of the 20 pedestrian gates located around the park's perimeter, via existing public transport links.
- Q)** **You're still proposing yellow lines and signage, so you've failed to avoid urbanisation of the park. Wooden posts doesn't cut it. The existence of signage is the impact. Good design (posts preventing parking instead of lining etc) means signage isn't needed. Legibility can be built in without the need for signs etc. You're just considering the cheapest solutions.**
- A)** There is a requirement to balance the requirements of an enforceable scheme whilst minimising the possible urbanisation of the park. We therefore propose the targeted use of yellow lines and signage at specific locations to aid pedestrian foot traffic and for health & safety purposes. Logs and wooden bollards will be utilised to aid with car park/carriageway boundary definitions, and wooden posts utilised for signage where possible. We are not proposing any disruption to natural areas of the Park and are in consultation with Natural England and Historic England on the proposed construction materials, methods and their locations.
- Q)** **In your consultation pack you state: "the use of double yellow lines will be minimised, and signage will be installed on wooden posts where possible". Where will yellow lines be painted and where will signage be installed other than at the entry points to the Park?**
- A)** It is proposed double yellows will be installed at Town Gate Triangle and at the carriageway entrance to Banners Gate, to provide protection for pedestrians. Signage will be installed at the vehicle entrance points to the park and within the car parks, and repeater/reminder signs are proposed along the carriageways within the park, to remind visitors of the requirement to pay for parking and not to cause obstructions when parking etc.
- Q)** **You have identified 25 'car parks' in the Park. Where are they all located? And how will visitors be made aware they need to pay for parking (and where to pay) if they don't use one of these 'car parks' but park instead on the dozens of different roads, lay-bys and grass verges dotted around the 2,100 acre Park?**
- A)** The car parks within project scope are the existing car parks that serve the park, which are located primarily around the perimeter of the park. It should be noted the proposals do not include any plans to increase land for parking provision.
Signage will be installed at each of the vehicular gates advising visitors that parking charges apply past this point and each of the car parks will have appropriate signage e.g. Have You Paid/Displayed, tariff boards, RingGo signage, disabled bay signage (where applicable).
In addition, repeater/reminder signs will be installed along the carriageways between the gates and the car park. Signage will be installed on wooden posts where possible.
- Q)** **You have stated that you will "improve accessibility through formal disabled parking spaces and improve existing pothole issues where possible". What budget have you set aside for repairing potholes, where will these repairs be made and when will these works take place? Are you also aware that Parks Officers have recently estimated that the cost of repairing the potholes in the Park today could be as high as £750,000?**

- A)** The project budget allows for targeted repairs prior to implementation. It is proposed significant repairs to carriageways and car parks will be completed post-implementation using car park revenue.
- Q)** **When, where and how many formal disabled parking bays be installed pre-implementation? And will car parking areas be tarmacked to enable disabled parking bays to be marked up?**
- A)** Subject to the outcome of this consultation, 39 disabled bays will be installed/formalised prior to implementation within the car parks at Banners Gate, Boldmere Gate, Dragonfly (Bracebridge), Grazing, Hawthorn, Holly, Kingfisher (Blackroot), Town Gate and Visitor Centre car parks. Where disabled bays are installed we will use EcoGrid (recycled plastic) i.e. the same installation process used at Boldmere Gate car park for B2022; where disabled bays are to be formalised, i.e. existing bays on tarmac, then bay measurements will be confirmed and bay markings updated. Compliant signage will be installed for all disabled bays.

Proposed Timescales

- Q)** **When will the decision be made? When are you expecting to put this into force?**
- A)** The consultation will end at midnight on Friday, 29th August. The consultation results will be collated and presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration and final decision. Subject to the outcome of this consultation, the implementation of the scheme will take place once the required processes are complete i.e. first phase parking restrictions, procurement of materials and works, construction works etc.

Events, Volunteers, Season Ticket and Staff of Businesses

- Q)** **Is there anything in place to support employees within the park with parking?**
- A)** Staff who are directly employed by businesses that operate within the park will be offered a 25% discount on the price of an annual season ticket.
- Q)** **Have you considered the indirect impact to reduce numbers on local businesses and if so what measures have you considered to help them?**
- A)** Feedback from park stakeholders from the informal consultation (completed in November/December 2024), highlighted the concerns of local businesses. The scheme plans were amended following this feedback i.e. reduced parking rates to lessen the impact on local trade. In addition, staff who are directly employed by businesses that operate within the park will be offered a 25% discount on the price of an annual season ticket.
- Q)** **If a person has an annual pass and the car park is full what would that person do especially if they are staff members of local business's, they would have paid for parking and therefore should be supported with space to park.**
- A)** An annual season ticket does not guarantee parking availability. If your chosen car park is full there will be other car parks nearby. All tickets will allow you to park at any of the car parks within the park.

- Q) Just to clarify. If you are driving into the park to go and eat at Blackroot, Browns or Bracebridge you will have to pay to park? What do these businesses say?**
- A)** To confirm, if approved, the charging scheme will apply to the whole of the park. Park stakeholders were consulted as part of the informal consultation (November/December 2024) and during this consultation. We are mindful of the impact the proposed charging scheme may have on businesses within the park and therefore as mentioned, the proposals were amended following feedback from the park stakeholders i.e. reduced parking rates.
- Q) Will all resident volunteers giving up their own free time to help out in the Park (e.g. Sutton Sea Scouts, Parkrun, Sutton Coldfield Litter Action Group etc) and all those that help out or participate in ad hoc charity and fundraising events in the Park be allowed free parking?**
- A)** Registered volunteers (approved by the Council) who assist with the park's upkeep will be issued free parking permits. The administration of parking permits to registered volunteers will be strictly controlled by the Parks' Ranger Service to prevent abuse.
- In line with the approach taken at Cannon Hill Park, Parkrun will be issued a set number of permits to repurpose amongst their volunteers. The same approach will be taken for the Sea Scouts.
- If, on the odd occasion, further permits are required (e.g. for a weekend event) then an advance request can be made to the Ranger Team at the Visitor Centre. In essence, for those who are volunteering for a third party organisation (excluding FoSPA) the days, duration and location of the required parking session/event needs to be understood if beyond the proposed permit holder access mentioned above.
- For other events, volunteer permits will be assessed on a case by case basis.

Financials and revenues

- Q) Why is BCC proposing car parking charge?**
- A)** As part of the City Council budget for 2025/26, the Parks Service has been asked to make a significant contribution to the overall budget position. To mitigate this impact, the Parks Service is looking for visitors to contribute to the ongoing upkeep of (and future improvements to) Sutton Park.
- The projected income from the proposed parking charges still falls short of the cost of maintaining the park and therefore it is deemed reasonable to ask car park users to contribute financially to the upkeep, maintenance and improvement of these parks. Despite the introduction of parking charges, there will still be a requirement for financial support from the Council's General Fund to maintain and manage the park.
- Q) If this is to be implemented, which by the sounds of it it's going to be no matter the objections, would the fine payments not be better spent funding the park which is what this whole scheme is meant to be for. Rather than for other projects**
- A)** Revenue from Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) is subject to the Section 55 restrictions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, meaning net surplus revenue from PCNs (once contractual costs have been considered) can only be used for Highways related improvements.

Q) Have the parking revenue estimates allowed for the reduced park opening hours in the winter months?

A) Yes, seasonal fluctuations in visitor numbers has been included within the business model.

Q) In the consultation document you identified the cost of operating the park and yet there is no mention of associated income that the park already generates, can you explain what that income is and where it currently goes

A) Income from events and the businesses and groups that operate within the park is ringfenced to the park budget code.

Q) How will the car parking revenue be used by BCC?

A) It is proposed that first two full years of the project's implementation, any surplus income achieved will be used to repay capital borrowing so that it can be cleared sooner than anticipated and release revenue for site improvements. After the first two full years, all surplus revenues, once operational costs have been considered, will be reinvested into the park to fund site improvements in line with the site management plan and in consultation with the statutory bodies.

Q) How can you justify borrowing to fund this project against the background of BCC's current huge debt pile?

A) The two-year borrowing term for the project is classified as Invest to Save i.e. borrowing will be utilised to introduce a scheme which will generate a sustainable income stream going forward.

Q) I don't see that much income will be generated for the park at all, it mostly seems to cover the running costs of the parking machines and NSL staff. Excess money from fines going to Highways instead of the park too. Visitors to the NNR are being used to pay for NSL and highways. Any urbanisation of the NNR is not acceptable - yellow lines and signs are not appropriate. Sounds like very very poor design is going to be adopted. Signage and lining is only required when design has failed.

A) The financial modelling has been developed collaboratively with park managers, using a combination of local observational data and historical usage patterns. The modelling has further been cross-checked against visitor footfall data to check for accuracy. Once borrowing has been repaid the projected revenue will exceed the ongoing operational costs for the scheme. To clarify, revenue from the scheme will be ringfenced for the park; only income from Penalty Charge Notices will pay for enforcement via NSL and for Highways improvements, in line with legislative requirements. The proposed scheme designs strive to minimise the possible urbanisation of the park whilst balancing the requirements for an enforceable parking scheme e.g. the use of double lines will be minimised, signage is to be installed on wooden posts where possible, repeater/reminder signs along the carriageway (as opposed to double yellow line marking).

- Q) Where is the detailed breakdown please of how the money raised is going to be reinvested into Sutton Park to make improvements? Potholes being filled, roads being resurfaced, Wi-Fi boosters being installed (as the signal in the part is poor. to enable electronic payments)**
- A)** The breakdown of the capital costs for the scheme are publicly available via the Council's CMIS (Committee Management Information System). The scheme's implementation is subject to the outcome of this consultation and therefore a detailed breakdown of how parking revenue will be used for improvements to the park is currently unavailable.
- Q) How will charges be initiated, through machines? A 30 min free period if not enough. 9am to 6pm in winter months is impossible. We already pay council taxes, why should people have to pay another £52 a year. You talked of parking but there is inadequate parking around the park.**
- A)** Vehicle owners will be expected to pay for their parking session via the Pay and Display machines (coin and card) or via RingGo (app or phone). The 30 minute free period has been proposed following feedback from the informal consultation to accommodate parents who drop off and pickup their children from the various groups that operate within the park.

In England as a whole, the 2023/24 local government revenue breakdown was approximately:

- 51% from UK Government grants
- 31% from council tax
- 15% from retained business rates

The Council's Parks Service core funding equates to 0.5% of the Council's annual budget. The annual costs of maintaining the park is £1 million – however these costs are not sufficient to maintain and improve the park.

The projected income from the proposed parking charges still falls short of the cost of maintaining the park and therefore it is deemed reasonable to ask car park users to contribute financially to the upkeep, maintenance and improvement of the park. Despite the introduction of parking charges, there will still be a requirement for financial support from the Council's General Fund to maintain and manage the park.

- Q) If the proposed parking charges do not go ahead, how will the park be maintained?**
- A)** The park will continue to operate using the operational budget in place. This budget is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the site's ongoing upkeep and does not provide scope for park improvements, however.
- Q) What if people change their behaviour and park outside the park? Because you need to repay the borrowing first. We are worried about the financial risk of this scheme.**
- A)** We are mindful of the impact of potential displacement parking and therefore propose a phased approach to parking restrictions, with the first phase to focus on existing parking hotspots and be introduced prior to the implementation of charging. The extent of phase two restrictions will be determined by resident feedback post-implementation. It is proposed any surplus income achieved during the borrowing period will be used to repay the capital borrowing, so that it can be cleared sooner than anticipated and release revenue for site improvements.

Q) Deciding on car parking, why have you decided on 7 days a week rather than weekends only or started charging at 11am to give regular park walkers chance to walk early. Is this just a money raising scheme. Could you at least give Christmas day?

A) The financial modelling and visitor footfall data indicates the park is heavily used throughout the week and not just weekends. The park will remain free to access outside the proposed chargeable period (i.e. 9am to 6pm), the benefit of which will be felt in the summer months.

Q) If you are listening to residents why are you still proceeding with the formal consultation given that only two people from 4,018 respondents supported the proposed introduction of car parking charges during December's informal consultation, and that almost 70% of respondents felt access to the Park should be free?

A) The Cabinet Report should have been worded more concisely. The sentence within the report you mention, stated “two respondents agreed with the consulted charges” – the “consulted charges” referred to the current Cannon Hill parking charge rates. In actuality, 31.8% of respondents agreed with parking charges (and 678 respondents suggested alternative parking charges to the Cannon Hill rates)

It is accepted the introduction of parking charges is often controversial and unpopular as users are asked to pay for something that has previously been free. However, the projected income from the proposed parking charges still falls short of the cost of maintaining the park (approximately £1 million per annum) but it should be noted this expenditure offers no scope for improvements within the park. It is therefore deemed reasonable to ask car park users to contribute financially to the upkeep, maintenance and improvement of the park. Despite the proposed introduction of parking charges, there will still be a requirement for financial support from the Council's General Fund to maintain and manage the park.

Parking charges across destination sites throughout the UK has become common practice and in the vast majority of cases parking charges for these sites have been in place for several years. Introducing charges on Birmingham's sites will be in line with national best practice to offset the cost of maintaining these destination sites.

Q) Several previous attempts to introduce car parking charges have been withdrawn as the project was deemed not financially viable. Why are these latest proposals any different?

A) Car parking charges have been explored over a number of years and a number of sites have been assessed for financial viability. Some of the sites with smaller car parks have been discounted as they are not financially viable – Sutton Park is not one of these sites.

Q) You expect to generate surplus revenues from 2028/29 onwards once the capital investment has been repaid. Can you guarantee that all surplus revenues generated in Sutton Park be wholly re-invested in Sutton Park, and not diverted elsewhere?

A) All surplus revenues, once operational costs have been considered, will be reinvested into the park.

- Q) You have suggested that you will achieve net revenue of around £248k in each of the first two full years of the project's implementation whilst your £700,000 borrowing costs are being repaid (BCC Cabinet Report May 2025). Why has this financial return in the first two years not been considered as 'surplus revenues'? Where will this money go?**
- A)** It is proposed any surplus income achieved during the borrowing period will be used to repay the capital borrowing, so that it can be cleared sooner than anticipated and release revenue for site improvements.
- Q) You have stated that from 2028/29 onwards surplus revenues will be used to fund investment opportunities to improve the park, provide reinvestment funds for the infrastructure and make improvements to the Park and overall visitor experience (e.g. pothole and fence repairs). Can you explain in more detail what these investment opportunities are?**
- A)** The Park Rangers have identified the following investment items:
- Continue improvements in developing a sense of place, including installation of entrance gates based upon the design installed at Boldmere Gate as part of the B2022 legacy
 - Improve interpretation including new map boards and orientation panels in strategic points across the site
 - Develop a rolling programme of maintenance on the extensive (15.6km) surfaced roads and paths on site alongside improving the car park facilities across the site based upon the design installed at Boldmere Gate as part of the B2022 legacy
 - Improvements to land management practices, as recommended by the Park Rangers, which are endorsed by Natural England, as per the management plan
 - Future investment in maintaining key infrastructure assets – the Visitor Centre, Play Areas, fencing, litter bins etc.
 - Target investment into properties owned by BCC within the site boundary (25) to safeguard and enable productive community or commercial use.
- Q) What are your priorities for improvements and repairs, and how much funding do you consider is needed at this moment in time to resolve all of these longstanding problems to address years of under-investment?**
- A)** Priorities for improvements and repairs will be determined by the Park Rangers, agreed with Natural England, and in line with the management plan for the park.
- Q) Since parking charges were introduced in Cannon Hill Park in 2017 you have increased charges by 88%, including a rise of 25% in the past two years alone. Can you commit to retaining the initial proposed car parking charge costs for Sutton Park and if so for how long?**
- A)** A case will be made to the decision makers on this point, however no commitment either way can be made at this stage.

- Q) The parking charges for Sheldon Country Park are being set lower than Sutton Park due to the "demographics of the local area". On what basis have you arrived at this opinion and are you aware that many visitors charged to park will be coming from outside the immediate local area, often from more deprived parts of the town and city?**
- A)** The Leader has asked that pricing for the parking schemes takes into consideration the demographics of the local area.
- Q) You have stated in your consultation pack that " the expenditure required to maintain Sutton Park alone each year is approximately £990k, but it should be noted this expenditure offers no scope for improvements within the park". Can you provide a detailed breakdown of this annual expenditure required to maintain the Park?**
- A)** The £990k is the allocated operational budget for the park (covering grounds maintenance, staffing, reservoir management etc).
- Q) What is the annual expenditure in the Park over each of the past three full financial years and projections for this current financial year, and can this be broken down into different criteria?**
- A)** This information is not currently available to share.
- Q) What is the current annual income (including rental income generated in Sutton Park over each of the past three full financial years and projections for this current financial year, and can this be broken down into more detail?**
- A)** This request falls outside of the scope of this project.

Data

- Q) Your data for the expected numbers of cars and revenue has come from conversations with the Park Rangers, District Parks Manager and others, or goes back to the Sunday/Bank Holiday vehicle charging scheme which was discontinued over five years ago. Yet your Risk Register ranks the likelihood that charges will lead to a reduction in park usage and that anticipated income levels will not be achieved as 'low'. How confident are you that your projections are accurate?**
- A)** The projected financial modelling for the scheme considers a possible 10% decrease in visitor numbers. It is felt the combination of reduced parking rates and effective parking restrictions (across two phases) will help minimise reduced car park usage.
- Experience from the Cannon Hill car parking project has shown no obvious decrease in visitor numbers as result of the implementation of charging, however a conservative approach to forecasting has been taken noting the profile of visitors to the park is different
- The financial modelling has been cross-referenced with visitor footfall data (platform which tracks the location of mobile phone apps) and the data tallies

- Q) Why didn't you carry out more reliable data gathering (e.g. installing data strips at the entrances) to monitor the volume of cars coming into the park?**
- A)** The financial modelling has been cross-checked against visitor footfall data (platform which tracks the location of mobile phone apps). There is no requirement for further data gathering.
- Q) What if any health and safety reviews have been conducted on the area and were any underline risks identified and if so what steps have been taken to mitigate those. The Council has an obligation when commercialising the area to review any associated risks incurred for example vehicle / pedestrian conflict.**
- A)** We have considered the movement of people within the scheme designs e.g. pedestrian access to P&D machines, and will complete risk assessments for each of the car parks (on the basis of access and movement of vehicles/pedestrians) subject to the outcome of the formal consultation
- Q) Could you share what impact assessments have been undertaken, e.g. landscape and visual, population and human health etc. From the very brief sharing of layout plans tonight, it's not clear how the new infrastructure has been placed in this incredibly sensitive environment.**
- A)** An equality impact assessment has been produced and will be reviewed throughout the project term. An environmental impact assessment has been completed and highlights no concerns. Risk assessments for each of the car parks will be completed subject to the outcome of the formal consultation.
- Q) There is a lot of local opposition to the proposed parking scheme. Will you listen to local residents and not go ahead with it?**
- A)** The decision to proceed with the scheme will be subject to the outcome of this consultation. A report will be shared with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration and final decision.
- Q) What notice are you taking of all the petitions that have been signed against this decision?**
- A)** The Council has not received any petition to date. If a petition is received the Council will respond to it in line with current procedure.
- Q) Only 10% contingency has been built into the scheme's capital costs. Why do you consider this is sufficient? What contingency percentage is usually built into other similar schemes?**
- A)** Contingencies have been built into each capital item within the budget. The 10% quoted is an overall budget contingency on top. This is deemed sufficient to cover unforeseen cost increases or delivery delays.
- Q) You expect to issue 500 annual parking passes at £52 each stating that "once charges are implemented the uptake of annual parking permits is expected to become commonplace' (BCC Cabinet Report May 2025). How have you arrived at this opinion given that so many respondents in the informal consultation rejected the annual parking permit?**
- A)** The figure of 500 annual parking season tickets will be built up over time i.e. we are not expecting visitors to purchase 500 season tickets on the date of implementation.

Q) Has any allowance been made for potential claims for accidents in potholes and footpaths not being maintained, or claims from residents living on the Four Oaks Estate forced to take measures themselves to close roads to tackle displaced parking on private roads where TROs cannot be enforced?

A) Insurance claims are dealt with corporately (and are corporately funded) so any insurance payouts would not come from the site budget. We acknowledge there is a risk of displacement parking at Hartopp Gate, but it is felt any restrictions would follow as part of the second phase i.e. based on resident feedback. If residents are experiencing displacement parking post-implementation, we will open discussions with the landowner to progress such restrictions. The proposed scheme will need time to “bed in” so that we do not rush into permanent parking restrictions which will inconvenience residents unnecessarily.

Q) What is the timetable for further consultations and potential implementation, including TROs on pre and post implementation schemes?

A) As per the information contained within the consultation pack and presentation, we propose a phased approach to parking restrictions – with the first phase to focus on known parking hotspots prior to implementation. The second phase of restrictions will follow post-implementation based on resident feedback.

Based on the outcome of this consultation we will then undertake an informal consultation on the first phase of restrictions (no date can be confirmed as yet). The date of the second phase of restrictions is as yet unknown. The scheme will need time to “bed in” so that we do not rush into permanent parking restrictions which will inconvenience residents unnecessarily.

Consultation

Q) Why did you choose this format of meeting? It would have been better in person at a local location. Residents had problems logging on and we couldn't actually talk and have a conversation - only submit questions.

A) There was uncertainty over likely attendance numbers, finding a suitable venue and associated costs. Therefore, it was deemed appropriate to offer a webinar session where the proposals could be explained and questions answered without disruption. Webinar sessions are a standard approach for consultation meetings. The presentation slide deck and Q&A document will be made available via BeHeard or email upon request.

Q) Why has the formal consultation period been so short and during holiday season?

A) The statutory consultation period for projects of this type is 3 weeks; however we extended the consultation window for an additional week to accommodate for summer holidays and to allow residents more time to respond. The timing of the consultation was based on the project timetable.

Biodiversity and environment

Q) Please can you be more specific about any of the biodiversity schemes that the reinvested money will contribute to?

- A)** Site improvements (including biodiversity schemes) funded via the proposed charging scheme will be in line with the site management plan and in consultation with the statutory bodies. No details can be shared at this point as the scheme is subject to the outcome of this consultation.
- Q)** **How do the parking charges promote an improvement in a greener future/ biodiversity to the park? Do the proposed parking charges have any positive/negative impact on the environment/biodiversity of the park?**
- A)** Charging for parking encourages a shift away from private car use leading to fewer car journeys, which directly reduces carbon dioxide emissions and harmful particulate matter in the air, improved air quality in and around parks for the benefit of both visitors and local wildlife and aligns with citywide carbon reduction targets.
- Parking charges can act as a prompt towards greater use of public transport, cycling and walking (particularly for repeat visitors and those living nearby), healthier lifestyles as active travel options become more attractive, and reduced traffic congestion.
- The proposed charging scheme can also assist with the protection of sensitive habitats by moderating visitor numbers and discouraging excessive car-based access. Sensitive ecological areas may experience less footfall and therefore a reduction in trampling, littering and disturbance to wildlife. In addition, the scheme may see improved habitat resilience, particularly in the nature reserve and conservation zones within the park.

Putting the Park into a Trust

- Q)** **In February 2021 Royal Sutton Coldfield Town Council provided you with a detailed independent report highlighting the parlous state of the park, which it found to be in a deteriorating condition with water pollution, crumbling infrastructure and general degradation. Encouraged to do so by yourselves the Town Council then followed this up with a second independent report in January 2022 setting out a range of alternative park governance options under different Trust models. The second report concluded: “Trust models can help generate greater investment in an open space. For those sites which were formerly managed by local authorities, the change in management model has enabled greater investment in the park. “The trust model enhances funding options and enables other benefits like gift aid, bequests and financial support from corporate bodies. Changing local perceptions of a site being a local authority managed site to a charitable trust managed site can help to engender greater sympathy and local investment. “The [Royal Sutton Coldfield] Town Council has held monthly meetings with you over the past three and a half years to discuss, agree and formalise an alternative governance model of Sutton Park on a trust basis to ensure the Park attracts inward investment enabling it to have a long-term sustainable future. Why did you recently pull out of these on-going discussions, with no forewarning or notice, given that the town council provided you with two independent reports (the second of which you encouraged) and after several years of discussions during which time the condition of the Park has fallen into further disrepair and neglect?**
- A)** This query is unrelated to the proposed parking scheme and therefore cannot be answered at this stage. We would advise you direct your query to the respective decision maker for such matters.