

Committee: Cabinet

Date: Thursday,
19 June 2025

Title: Takeley and Little Canfield Parking Consultation

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Neil Hargreaves,
Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economy

Report Author: Sarah Lewin, Economic Development Manager

Key decision: No

Summary

1. Parish Councils and Ward members in villages in the south of the district have expressed concern about 'fly parking' on a frequent basis.
2. The Uttlesford Parking Review 2022 also highlighted this issue and as part of this Review an Airport Parking Options Report was compiled and is attached as Appendix A.
3. As part of the Review a wider consultation was proposed to try and take a holistic view of parking issues and devise a village wide scheme.

Takeley and Little Canfield was chosen as pilot for this approach as it appeared that the issues here were most likely to be caused by airport parkers. The consultation was carried out in January 2025.

4. Uttlesford District Council is not the highways authority but agreed to co-ordinate the consultation and feedback process to NEPP for their information and consideration. The consultation results will also be shared with Takeley and Little Canfield Parish Councils.
5. UDC's GIS system identified 2,400 homes in the Takeley and Little Canfield area which were likely to be affected by any parking restriction. A local leaflet delivery company was used to deliver 2,000 leaflets to the most affected homes and additional steps were taken to ensure as many residents as possible knew about the consultation.
6. The council received 395 responses to the consultation. Assuming one response per household, this is approximately a 16% response rate. Of those, about half, 8% of the total households, considered that restrictions of some type should be implemented.
7. These percentages fall very significantly below the threshold response rate of 50% required by the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP) to consider parking restrictions. Therefore, with community support lacking, the report does not make recommendations for area wide restrictions. Analysis of responses received are attached as Appendix B.

Recommendations

8. Cabinet is asked to note the contents of this report

Financial Implications

9. None

Background Papers

10. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

[Uttlesford car parking review 2022 - Uttlesford District Council](#)

Impact

- 11.

Communication/Consultation	Consultation with residents, businesses, parish and ward members in affected area. CMT and ICB
Community Safety	N/A
Equalities	N/A
Health and Safety	N/A
Human Rights/Legal Implications	N/A
Sustainability	N/A
Ward-specific impacts	Takeley and Little Canfield Parish councils have been actively pursuing parking restrictions and will be disappointed no agreement could be reached
Workforce/Workplace	N/A

Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO)

12. Requests for parking restrictions are considered by the North Essex Parking Partnership and must meet certain criteria set out in the Traffic Regulation Orders - General policy 2022.
13. In the case of consultations there must be a 50% response rate of the responses received, 50% must be in favour of the proposed change except for resident permit schemes which require 75% support. If the response rates meet these criteria a scheme will be costed, and a report will be submitted to the NEPP Joint Committee to proceed with a proposed Traffic Regulation Order.

14. If either criterion is not met, this will be reflected as a lack of support for the scheme and will result in the scheme being considered as low priority and may result in no further action being taken.
15. The NEPP, regardless of the outcome of informal consultation, can implement a scheme when it is deemed essential. For example, to address concerns of the emergency services specific traffic management needs or on a temporary basis.

Situation

16. Parish Councils and Ward members in villages in the south of the district have highlighted issues with 'fly parking' on a frequent basis. The view that customers to Stansted Airport use nearby residential streets to park for free then use taxis, buses or walk to and from the airport terminal has been repeatedly expressed to the District and County Councils.
17. The 'fly parking' causes problems to residents as it restricts the supply of on-street parking spaces, access to driveways and creates visibility concerns at junctions. This view was expressed in the consultation carried out in June 2022 as part of the Parking Strategy and more recently in January 2025.
18. The 2022 Uttlesford Parking Review, carried out by independent parking consultants, Parking Matters Ltd, recognised that the scale of the issue is unclear. No detailed surveys have been carried out, and it is likely that a deficit of on-street parking for residents could exist even without additional airport parking. However, the presence of measures to tackle parking problems around airports across the country suggests that there is a problem related to airport parking.
19. The Review produced an associated Airport Parking Option report that considered the approaches taken around other airports in the country including Heathrow, Gatwick, Manchester, Luton and Bristol.
20. Luton, Gatwick and Heathrow rely heavily on the use of residents only parking schemes (RPS) in nearby streets to control airport parking. The Luton example is comparable because of its similar in size and mode share. Bristol Airport, although smaller, is comparable in location as it's in a rural area with villages rather than adjoining built up urban areas around it. Bristol uses red routes, yellow lines and timed restrictions; Controlled Parking Zones or 'CPZ's. Manchester takes a mixed approach with some local restrictions and targeted smaller RPS.
21. TRO applications are made to address specific issues which frequently only serve to displace the problem to nearby streets. As part of the Review a wider consultation was proposed to try and take a holistic view of parking issues and devise a village wide scheme. Takeley and Little Canfield was chosen as pilot for this approach as it was felt the issues here were most likely to be caused by airport parkers.
22. UDC officers worked with NEPP and the consultants to create suitable options for potential restrictions and a public consultation was carried out in January 2025.
23. The Council's GIS system identified 2,400 homes in the Takeley and Little Canfield area.
24. Council officers worked hard to ensure as many people as possible knew about the consultation:

- Over 2000 leaflets were delivered by a local leaflet delivery company to households directly affected by the proposed restrictions
- Additional leaflets were delivered by Council officers
- Pop up information events were held at Old School Community Hub in Takeley and Priors Green Community Centre
- Local schools were asked to send information to all parents
- A press release was issued to local papers in Uttlesford and Bishops Stortford
- Social media posts were put in resident Facebook groups
- Posters were situated on lamp posts, bus stops, village halls and local shops

25. The results of the consultation are reported fully in Appendix B. In summary:

- 395 submissions were received with 354 online and 41 on paper. To satisfy the NEPP policy a return of at least 1,000 responses would be required. Please note not all responses received answered all of the questions.
- Those who did respond were split roughly 50:50 on the question 'are any additional parking restrictions required'.

26. Significant variations were noted street-by-street which reflects local factors such as on-street and off-street supply, geography and current restrictions.

- Almost two-thirds of respondents supported an extension to the B1256 Parsonage Road Red Route and also supported new Red Routes along Roding Dr, Fleming Rd, Bennet Canfield, Honey Rd and Warwick Rd. However, a high number of the remaining respondents considered this would cause problems for residents and that a permit system may be preferable.
- No consensus on possible residential area parking restrictions. In general, 41% who responded want to see a controlled parking zone on their street. 32% would prefer a resident parking zone and 27% said they did not want any parking restrictions

27. In their submission, Takeley Parish Council supported the extension and addition of Red Routes and the retention of existing CPZs. They proposed new CPZs and some small residents only zones.

28. Little Canfield Parish Council supported the extension and addition of red routes to key roads and a new CPZ.

29. A leaflet will be distributed to residents outlining the response to the consultation and confirming that no further action will be taken at this time.

30. The consultation report will be shared with the relevant parishes, ward members, NEPP and Essex County Council.

Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Reputation damage as some residents will be expecting parking measures to be introduced	2	2	Leaflet distributed to homes advising of the outcome of the consultation and explaining why no more action can be taken.
Increased fly parking in villages close to the airport	2	2	Promotion of webpage letting residents know how to report fly parking

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.