

# NO YELLOW LINES

**Tony Hughes**  
**Glasgow City Council**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Few transport professionals today will disagree that there is a requirement for some means of indicating to road users where on the road they may and may not park their vehicles.

In the UK, there is a general ban on all parking on motorways and clearways, except in emergencies, and these are signed accordingly at entry points. On most other roads, it has become the norm, particularly in built-up areas, to indicate specifically where parking is prohibited, by painting yellow lines<sup>1</sup> along carriageway edges. In most cases, these lines require to be accompanied by time plates<sup>2</sup> detailing the times of the prohibition and to which vehicles it applies.

As the length of carriageways requiring to be marked in yellow paint becomes ever greater and the restrictions on parking increase in sophistication, it is opportune, for reasons of visual intrusion, cost and efficacy, to consider whether there might be a better way of indicating the precise extents of parking prohibitions. This is particularly the case in Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs)<sup>3</sup>, where current regulations require the entire length of every road to be marked to indicate, either with yellow lines that parking is not permissible or with white bay markings that it is<sup>4</sup>.

In this paper, I report on Glasgow City Council's experience in prohibiting parking without the use of yellow lines and argue for the universal adoption of this practice in Controlled Parking Zones.

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1. Fifty Years Ago

Fifty years ago, there were no yellow lines. It appears that parking was adequately regulated by a combination of Highway Code rules advising where vehicles should not be parked and road studs or white paint indicating on-road 'parking places'.

It may be just coincidence but I think it worth noting that the introduction of yellow lines followed soon after relaxation of the legislation relating to the illumination of parked vehicles<sup>5</sup>. Until 1956, any vehicle parked on a road at night had to display a white light to the front and a red light to the rear. To minimise current drain from vehicle batteries, many drivers used portable parking lamps, although even these had a significant draining effect on the battery, when lit continuously throughout the hours of darkness.

Consequently, most drivers sought off-road parking places for their vehicles overnight and would use these same parking places during the day, if not using their vehicles. Thus the only vehicles parked on-road tended to be those in use that day. Parking for these could readily be found, without parking in those

locations that now require to be marked with yellow lines. This was especially true in residential areas, where CPZs are increasingly common today.

Of course, the relaxation of vehicle lighting regulations has not been the only influence on parking behaviour over the past fifty years. A considerable increase in the number of vehicles on the road and the need to adjudicate between those legally and illegally parked have also contributed to the need, in most built-up areas, to indicate on the carriageway precisely where parking is or is not permitted. Nevertheless, I still wonder if there would have been a need for yellow lines, had there been no relaxation of the lighting regulations.

## **2.2. The Introduction of Yellow Lines**

Reference to the report of the working party, set up to consider whether the experimental use of yellow lines in some Buckinghamshire towns in the late 1950s should be adopted UK-wide<sup>6</sup>, reveals that environmental considerations were a key driver from the outset. Poles, in particular, were considered visually intrusive and the adoption of yellow line carriageway markings was seen as a means of reducing their numbers from what was required under the previous regime of 'no waiting' and 'waiting limited' signs.

There were also environmental objections to the use of yellow lines<sup>7</sup> and, to minimise both environmental intrusion and cost, it is obviously sensible to minimise the amount of road marking required. Those who proposed painting yellow lines, to indicate prohibitions on parking, must have surmised that that there would always be a greater length of carriageway overall where parking was permissible than where it was not. While almost certainly correct, this reasoning falls down, if there is simultaneously a need to mark parking bays, where parking is permissible and yellow lines where it is not, as is currently the case in a CPZ.

## **2.3. The Controlled Parking Zone**

The Controlled Parking Zone was introduced, as an integral part of the 'yellow line' signing regime, with the aim of further reducing the number of road signs (and associated poles) required to advise motorists of restrictions on waiting and loading. Provided that the restriction on waiting and loading is uniform throughout the zone, it need only be detailed on signs at the entry to the zone<sup>8</sup>, avoiding the need for time plates within the zone.

Unfortunately, the need often arises for more than one form of waiting and/or loading restriction with a CPZ. For example, some lengths of road may require a ban on waiting and loading at all times, while elsewhere a ban might only be required during the working day. Since it is not possible to detail both restrictions on the zone entry sign, it is necessary to erect time plates in association with at least one of the restrictions. This significantly reduces the benefits claimed for the CPZ as regards less sign clutter and still requires all roads to be marked with paint.

# **3. GLASGOW'S EXPERIMENTAL SCHEMES**

## **3.1. Candleriggs Demonstration Project**

Some fifteen years ago, a 'Millennium Plan' was devised for Glasgow city centre, the 'Millennium' moniker chosen as a large part of the plan was programmed to be in

place by the eagerly awaited turn of the century. The plan comprised a suite of traffic management and public realm improvements, aimed at making the city centre more aesthetically and environmentally attractive to pedestrians, many of whom would be engaged in shopping and business activities.

Restrictions on through traffic movement were to be combined with limited pedestrianisation, significant footway widening and extensive use of natural stone materials. The vision for the refurbished streetscape was to minimise any requirement to indicate waiting and loading restrictions with yellow lines and their accompanying time plates.

Prior to full-scale implementation of the Millennium Plan, it was considered prudent to test the concepts in a number of demonstration projects. One of these, in Candleriggs, entailed repaving the carriageway in traditional granite setts and the adjoining footways in Caithness slabs. Candleriggs was already marked with yellow-lined waiting and loading restrictions and white-lined designated parking bays, as it lay within the City Centre CPZ. These restrictions required amendment to suit the new road layout and it was proposed that the amended restrictions be indicated without using paint.

Since there was to be no restriction on vehicular access to the repaved street and a kerbed differentiation between carriageway and footway was to be retained, special authorisation was sought from the Scottish Office for a variant of the Controlled Parking Zone entry sign and associated time plates, which directed motorists to park only in designated bays. As Candleriggs was an historic street, authorisation was granted, on a two year trial basis, for the signs and also for the use of stainless steel strips and road studs, rather than white lines, to mark the perimeters of parking and loading bays respectively.

Disappointingly, the scheme was not an unqualified success, as regards the unconventional signing and lining. The stainless steel strips used to designate the on-road parking bays were found to work loose under traffic loading and were gradually replaced with conventional white-painted markings. Motorists' difficulties in understanding the markings proved to be a more intractable problem, particularly on those lengths of carriageway outwith the parking and loading bays.

Almost all motorists, who received a penalty charge notice (PCN), for parking outwith the marked bays, claimed ignorance of the restrictions. Plausibly in some cases, motorists claimed to have missed seeing the signs on entry to the repaved street. Undoubtedly, a factor was that, being already within the city centre CPZ, they would not be expecting to pass another zone entry sign. On the contrary, many thought they had struck lucky, locating the only length of road within the city centre where parking was free of charge!

At the end of the two year trial period, a mandatory 20 mph speed limit was introduced and the zone entry signing was accordingly enhanced but parking outwith the marked bays continued. Consequently, narrow, primrose yellow lines have now been painted to indicate the extent of waiting and loading restrictions, both in Candleriggs and also in subsequent city centre public realm projects.

### **3.2. Belmont Lane CPZ**

Undeterred by the difficulties encountered in Candleriggs, a second parking control scheme omitting yellow lines was proposed for a setted back lane in the West End of the city. No change was planned here to the existing streetscape but waiting and loading restrictions were required to keep the lane free of parked cars to allow residents access to their garages and cleansing vehicles access for refuse collection.

The attractions of a 'yellow-free' zone here were both aesthetic and practical. Double yellow lines either side of a lane only 4 metres wide would be particularly visually intrusive in a Victorian conservation area and also difficult to maintain in place on smooth granite setts. Loading was to be permitted only in a small area at one end of the lane and signed with time plates. Authorisation was sought for omission of yellow lines, a variant of the controlled zone entry sign, advising motorists against waiting or loading except in the designated area and the associated time plates.

The requisite authorisation for this 'historic area' was granted for an initial period of three years. Contrary to the Council's experience in Candleriggs, the waiting and loading restrictions in Belmont Lane were generally observed, with few of those booked for contraventions claiming ignorance of the restrictions. On reporting these findings to the Scottish Executive, authority was received to make the signing regime permanent.

### **3.3. Port Dundas CPZ Extension**

Trip end parking controls are Glasgow City Council's principal means of restricting the use of private cars for commuting to the city centre. Planning controls have been imposed on the amount of private, non-residential (PNR) parking space provided in new office developments in the city centre for the past 30 years. More recently, these controls have been supplemented by a gradual extension of on-road parking controls to all streets in the city centre.

Unsurprisingly, one effect of these controls on city centre car parking has been to displace commuter parking to areas immediately peripheral to the city centre. Commuter parking in these areas, within walking distance of city centre offices, inconveniences residents and businesses, who are then unable to find vacant on-road parking spaces convenient for their own use. To address this problem and further reduce the use of cars for commuting trips to the city centre, Glasgow City Council's Local Transport Strategy, 2001-2004 entitled 'Keep Glasgow Moving', committed the authority to extending the city centre CPZ into the peripheral areas.

Port Dundas was formerly the city's canal port and lies immediately north of the city centre, from which it is separated by the M8 motorway. It comprises a mix of industrial buildings used for business purposes and derelict land. The use of the roads in this area for commuter car parking was impeding business activity and, in particular, heavy goods vehicle (HGV) access to industrial premises.

There was no aesthetic imperative here to preclude the use of yellow lines and associated time plates but there were sound practical reasons for doing so. First among these was cost. Some 12,000 metres of yellow lines and associated time plates were required to prohibit waiting and loading and maintain unimpeded

access for HGVs. The installation of these was estimated to cost almost £15,000 as compared to just over £3,000 for a 'no yellow line' scheme and a similar cost penalty would apply as regards subsequent maintenance. In addition, the irregular kerb lines of many of the roads, where they fronted derelict land, made it difficult to neatly lay edge of carriageway markings. Thus it was decided, once again, to seek authorisation to dispense with yellow lines. This authorisation was obtained, despite the area not being designated 'historic'.

Despite our success in Belmont Lane, as regards compliance with the unmarked waiting and loading restrictions, we were concerned that a similar level of compliance might be difficult to achieve in Port Dundas, due to the derelict nature of the area. To avert such an outcome, leaflets were placed on cars routinely parking in the area, during the weeks immediately prior to the restrictions coming into effect, advising of the new signing regime. In addition, the zone entry signs were supplemented with temporary signs alerting motorists to the significance of the absence of yellow lines. To reinforce this message, the zone entry signs were deliberately sited precisely where adjoining yellow line restrictions terminated.

Compliance with the waiting and loading restrictions was found to be equal to, if not better than, that in Belmont Lane. This suggested that the nature of the area selected for the 'no yellow line' treatment was less important than the ability to clearly signal to motorists their entry into it. It now appeared that the imposition of zonal parking controls without yellow lining was not only possible but highly desirable and certainly an option for the large residential area, lying immediately west of the city centre and next in line for the introduction of parking controls.

#### **4. THE WESTERN EXTENSION OF GLASGOW'S CITY CENTRE CPZ**

##### **4.1. The Western Extension Area**

The area immediately west of the city centre in which commuter parking was proving problematic for local residents and businesses runs in an arc north and eastwards from the Clydeside Expressway (A814) to the Glasgow Branch of the Forth and Clyde Canal. It extends westwards as far as Partick and Hyndland but those commuters parking in these last mentioned districts require to use public transport to reach the city centre after parking their cars.

The bulk of the requests to the Council for a western extension of parking controls had been received from residents in the Woodlands area of the city and businesses in the Park area. On-road parking controls had been proposed for the Park area many years earlier but the proposals were thwarted by complaints from residents in Woodlands and other neighbouring areas that any controls in the Park area alone would exacerbate the problems they were already facing due to the displacement of commuters' cars to their streets.

Consequently, it was concluded that any proposal to introduce parking controls west of the city centre would need to cover an area large enough to minimise the possibility of merely shifting the problem elsewhere. The area south of the Clydeside Expressway was already subject to parking controls, as was the Port Dundas area to the east (described above). These then formed obvious boundaries for the new extension area. Less obvious was how far to extend the area westwards. It was, however, decided to draw a distinction between the area within

walking distance of the city centre and that beyond. This neatly coincided with the eastern boundary of the existing Hillhead CPZ.

#### **4.2. Yellow Lines or 'Yellow Free'?**

Early consultations with residents and businesses in the Park area had indicated that environmental considerations were extremely important as regards the potential introduction of parking controls. Many feared that extensive lengths of yellow lining and their accompanying time plates and poles would adversely impact on Park's Conservation Area status and, in turn, on the value of their property. They and the local conservation trust were pleased to learn that a scheme without yellow lines was at least a possibility.

Practical considerations also favoured a CPZ without yellow lines for the following reasons:

- Both capital and maintenance costs were reduced, if yellow lines and associated time plates were omitted;
- Many of the lanes and some road channels in the conservation area were paved with natural stone materials making marking maintenance problematic;
- A significant number of lanes, most of which were privately maintained, were unsurfaced, making the application of any markings impossible without remedial work to their surfaces;
- A temporary absence of road markings (e.g. following a utility opening) does not prevent enforcement of parking restrictions, since any absence of markings conveys a prohibition of parking.

The chief drawback to the 'yellow-free' proposal was considered to be its potential unenforceability. There was a fear that the compliance with the restrictions evident in Belmont Lane and Port Dundas would not be replicated in the larger western extension area. Reasons cited for this were:

- More casual visitors unfamiliar with the scheme and its signing;
- More demand for parking spaces;
- Motorists, determined to avoid parking charges, would claim ignorance of the restrictions.
- The proximity of existing, conventionally marked, parking controls.

This final bullet suggested that the level of compliance in the western extension area might be nearer to that experienced in Candleriggs than to that in Belmont Lane and Port Dundas. The western extension area is traversed by a number of arterial roads, which were already marked throughout their lengths with a combination of limited-stay parking bays and yellow lined waiting and loading restrictions. It had been decided at the outset that these arterial roads would be excluded from any western extension of city centre parking controls for three reasons:

- The existing restrictions had been applied on a route basis and a change of regime over a short length of that route might confuse motorists;
- The CPZ would include resident parking permits which would be inappropriate for use on roads subject to peak period prohibitions of waiting;
- The arterial routes usefully subdivided the western extension area into a number of sub zones which could be used for permit administration.

The difference between the Candleriggs zone and the proposed western extension, as regards the proximity of existing yellow lined restrictions, is that the restrictions adjacent to Candleriggs are also within a CPZ, whereas those on the arterial routes are not. It was thus concluded that, provided the entry points to any 'yellow-free' zone were conspicuously marked, it should be possible to minimise opportunities for confusion arising from an absence of yellow lines.

However, a further difficulty perceived with the 'yellow-free' option was making provision for loading vehicles. In the Candleriggs, Belmont Lane and Port Dundas parking zones already introduced, the restriction prevalent outwith marked bays was no waiting, no loading, at any time. Loading activities were restricted to designated bays signed accordingly<sup>9</sup>. In the western extension area, demand for parking spaces was anticipated to remain, after the introduction of the controls, at a level which would preclude the designation of dedicated loading bays uniformly throughout the area. Instead, it had been decided to designate loading bays only at those locations where an HGV required routine access to a particular length of kerb line, e.g. outside public houses.

It was recognised that the occasional 'white van', delivering white goods or furniture to residential or office premises, would not use a designated loading bay at any distance from the premises concerned. Instead, the driver could be expected to stop his van as near as possible to his destination, double parking<sup>10</sup>, or parking outwith marked parking bays if convenient. There was considerable debate within the City Council's traffic policy and parking enforcement sections as to whether or not this could be tolerated on a short term basis and outlawed if occurring for longer periods.

If yellow lining were used, a distinction could be drawn between 'no waiting' and 'no loading' by the use of kerb markings<sup>11</sup>. This would not be possible with the 'yellow-free' option. On the other hand, in some streets the space did not exist to mark lengths of 'no waiting' (loading permitted) lining, any more than it did to designate 'loading only' bays. The argument thus distilled into whether or not double parking and parking at locations where all loading would ordinarily be banned (e.g. near road junctions) could be tolerated for short periods. Eventually, it was decided that it could, on the basis that it would, in all probability, rarely occur and that the streets involved were not major traffic routes. The decision demonstrated, perhaps surprising, faith in drivers to behave reasonably: observations suggest that most drivers avoid parking obstructively whenever possible.

One further consideration, which followed from the above reasoning, was the possibility that the universal right of disabled drivers to park on-road, wherever loading is permitted, would frustrate the introduction of a 'yellow-free' solution, which permitted loading throughout the zone. Here again, considerable faith was placed in disabled drivers parking sensibly. Experience in Glasgow indicated that most genuine blue badge holders gravitated towards designated disabled bays, where these were available. Consequently, it was argued that, in a yellow-free zone, these same drivers would likely use designated parking bays, where these were available, in preference to parking outwith them. Comfort was also taken from the proviso in the national blue badge legislation that no vehicle should be parked such that it caused an obstruction. Thus it appeared possible to allow

short term double parking by white vans off-loading goods, without opening the floodgates to a host of double-parked cars sporting blue badges.

### **4.3. The Proposals as Advertised**

Having carefully considered the alternative marking regimes, it was decided to mark a conventional CPZ in one of the nine sub zones proposed for the western extension area and omit yellow lines in the remaining eight. The sub zone to be marked conventionally, Cranstonhill, contained many streets already marked with yellow line restrictions. As a result, there was less of a cost advantage in promoting a 'yellow-free' zone than elsewhere and the costs of introducing such a zone would include those for burning-off a significant length of existing yellow lining. There were also no unsurfaced lanes in Cranstonhill. For all other sub zones, the benefits of the 'yellow-free' option were considered to outweigh the drawbacks.

Attention next centred on obtaining the required authorisation for the proposed signing. Although proposals for similar signing regimes by authorities south of the border had now resulted in reference being made to 'Restricted Zone' signing in the Traffic Signs Manual<sup>12</sup>, it was still necessary to obtain special authorisation to use it. In view of the need identified above (4.2) to make entry to the zones as conspicuous as possible, it was decided that authorisation should also be sought for a carriageway marking, similar to that used at the entry points to London's congestion charging zone, to complement the vertical signs.

We became aware in discussions with the Scottish Executive that the DfT were expressing a preference for the vertical signs to read 'Restricted Parking Zone' and we were happy to adopt this wording. Authorisation was duly granted for the entry signs and also to paint 'Restricted Parking Zone', in white letters on a red background with a white border, across the carriageway at the entry points to the zone.

The proposals to extend parking controls west of Glasgow city centre were advertised for public consultation during the six weeks ending on 22 April 2005. Following the Council's consideration of responses to this consultation, Traffic Regulation Orders were made introducing the Cranstonhill CPZ and Restricted Parking Zones (RPZs) covering the Belmont, Spiersgate, Woodside, Woodlands, Park, Sandyford and Kelvingrove areas of the city.

In the RPZs, the parking controls comprise:

- The prohibition of all waiting outwith marked bays at all times;
- Charges for parking and restrictions on length of stay within marked parking bays during specified hours;
- Designated bays for goods vehicle loading at all times;
- Designated bays for blue badge holders at all times;
- Designated bays for motorcycles at all times.

### **4.4. Implementing the RPZ**

Building on our experience in implementing the Port Dundas parking controls, leaflets detailing the way in which the RPZ would operate were placed on the windscreens of all vehicles parked in the roads, which were to be subject to the new controls. It was stressed that, once the RPZ became effective, vehicles should only be parked in bays marked to Diagram 1032<sup>13</sup>. Encouragingly, it was found

that, as soon as this marking was laid, motorists gravitated to the marked bays, in preference to parking outwith them.

All parking bays were to be 'shared' between permit holders and those parking on a single stay basis. Charges for the single stays were to be collected by cash payment into a 'pay-and-display' ticket-issuing machine. To minimise both costs and any adverse visual impacts, time plates were mounted on existing street furniture, walls and railings, wherever possible.

At each entry point to the RPZ, the specially authorised variant of the Controlled Zone entry sign<sup>14</sup> was erected. A protective overlay was applied to the face of these signs which, as well as discouraging their disfigurement, enabled notices to be affixed advising of the forthcoming controls. It had been intended, as intimated above, to supplement the entry signs with the, also specially authorised, carriageway marking. However, motorists' willingness to park only within the designated bays, once these had been marked out, appeared to render this supplementary carriageway marking unnecessary. Consequently, it has been omitted, for the present at least, to further reduce the visual impact of the controls.

#### **4.5. Operational Experience**

The RPZ has been found to operate just as well as neighbouring CPZs in terms of making motorists aware of where they are permitted to park. No problems have arisen as a consequence of the use of conventional yellow lines in adjacent streets. On the contrary, the termination of yellow lining at the zone entry points appears to assist in alerting motorists to the RPZ restrictions.

Similarly, allowing loading throughout the zone, including alongside unmarked lengths of kerb, appears to result in less abuse of the loading relaxation than is the case when a single yellow line is marked. This is likely to be due, at least in part, to the fact that most such loading causes an obstruction for the duration of the activity and lends support to the view that a majority of drivers will park safely, wherever possible. For the same reason, fewer unmarked lengths of road are used for parking by disabled persons' blue badge-holders than would be the case, were these lengths of road marked with a single yellow line.

The use of 'goods vehicle only' loading bays at those locations where lengthy loading activity routinely occurs has been found to be effective in ensuring easy access for deliveries, although some car drivers have complained about not being able to park in close proximity to these premises. These bays have also been located where goods vehicles require to service premises adjacent to road junctions, where all waiting and loading would otherwise require to be prohibited.

Most encouragingly, and somewhat unexpectedly, compliance with the no waiting restrictions has been found to be better in the RPZ than in Glasgow's yellow-lined CPZs. This has enabled the Council to reduce the enforcement effort required within the RPZ with consequent cost savings.

### **5. THE ADVANTAGES OF NO YELLOW LINES FOR ZONAL PARKING CONTROL**

#### **5.1. Reduced Visual Intrusion**

Glasgow City Council first sought to omit yellow lines solely for environmental reasons and, in line with DfT and Scottish Office advice, the initial schemes were

confined to historic areas. However, it became apparent that omitting yellow lines might bring further benefits, in addition to a reduction in visual intrusion, and Glasgow's more recent schemes have shown these to be:

- Cost savings as regards signing, lining and enforcement
- The ability to control parking on unsurfaced roads
- A clear distinction between markings within and outwith the zone
- A time plate at every parking place and loading bay
- Motorists' understanding of the restrictions.

## **5.2. Cost Savings**

Cost savings will vary depending on the mix and layout of restricted and permitted parking in a zone. However, the cost of marking and signing only permitted parking bays will always be less than that for marking both within a controlled zone and often significantly so. In addition, Glasgow's recently introduced RPZs are proving cheaper to enforce than yellow-lined restrictions due to better compliance by motorists.

## **5.3. Unsurfaced Roads**

Within a Controlled Zone, motorists will always seek out any unrestricted length of road to circumvent the restrictions. If these restrictions are dependent on clearly marked yellow lines for their enforcement, this obviously becomes problematic when markings are missing due to wear and tear, a poor road surface or a part-complete utility reinstatement. Such problems do not occur, when the absence of any markings denotes a prohibition of parking.

## **5.4. Clarity of Zonal Signing**

In my experience, it is rare, outside London, for a single waiting/loading restriction to be universally applicable throughout a Controlled Zone. Consequently, it is usually necessary to use of time plates for at least some of the restrictions within a zone, marked with yellow lines. This blurs the distinction between the signs and road markings within a CPZ and those used outside it. Further confusion is generated by any difference in the times detailed on the time plates and those shown on the entry signs. It is perhaps hardly surprising that, in a recent survey Which? found that 28% of the public were unsure of where they were permitted to park.<sup>15</sup> This confusion does not arise when yellow lines are omitted within a CPZ, since it is obvious to all that they should park only within marked bays, in accordance with the instruction given on the entry signing.

## **5.5. A Time Plate at every Parking Place and Loading Bay**

Unpublished research carried out for the DfT<sup>16</sup> found that motorists have difficulty assimilating and retaining information displayed on CPZ entry signs and suggests that there is a strong case for providing parking regulatory information close to where parking will occur. This effectively precludes any benefit resulting from yellow-lined CPZs, since these were originally introduced to minimise any requirement to use of time plates. On the other hand it lends support to the omission of yellow lines and the marking of only parking and loading bays, with accompanying time plates, as in Glasgow's recently introduced Restricted Parking Zones.

## **5.6. Motorists' Understanding of the Restrictions**

The chief disadvantage anticipated to result from the omission of yellow lines was confusion, due to motorists' familiarity with them as *the* means of denoting prohibitions on waiting. However, except in Candleriggs, where the roads from which yellow lining was omitted were 'nested' within a larger CPZ, this disadvantage has not materialised to any great extent. On the contrary, the termination of conventional yellow lines at the entry points to the 'yellow-free' zones may assist in motorists' understanding of the restrictions within the zone. Certainly, compliance with 'no waiting' restrictions has been found to be better in RPZs than in yellow-lined CPZs, making them a more effective means of zonal parking control.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS**

### **6.1. RPZs are preferable to yellow-lined CPZs for Zonal Controls**

The continued development of the UK system of yellow lines and associated time plates to show both where waiting and loading is permitted and where it is not, for varying categories of vehicle at varying times of day has resulted in the use of an increasingly complicated array of signs. In CPZs, Zone Entry signs complicate matters still further. Research undertaken on behalf of the DfT<sup>19</sup> suggests that both local authority officers and the motoring public have difficulty in understanding the currently prescribed CPZ signing. The research recommends a redesign of CPZ signs and time plates and the erection of time plates throughout every CPZ as a way forward.

I believe that this would do little to improve the comprehension of CPZ signing and nothing to improve amenity. Glasgow City Council's experience of RPZs suggests that they constitute a better method of signing zonal parking restrictions than do yellow-lined CPZs, in terms of motorists' compliance with the regulations. This appears to be due to the signing within an RPZ showing simply where and when parking is permitted, rather than attempting also to show where and when it is not. RPZ signing is also preferable to the currently generally authorised CPZ signing on amenity grounds.

### **6.2. RPZ signing should be generally authorised**

If it were possible to dispense with yellow lines and their associated time plates in Glasgow City Centre, there would be significant environmental benefits, particularly in the Public Realm areas. As well as reducing visual intrusion, pedestrians would benefit from fewer sign poles. However, in the light of our experience with a RPZ 'nested' within a CPZ, it is considered that the city centre's Public Realm areas could only be treated in this way, if the entire City Centre CPZ were to become an RPZ.

It is considered that, for this to happen, the RPZ would need to become much more common than at present, particularly on account of the number of visitors motoring in the city centre. I would therefore urge the DfT to issue general authorisation for the use of RPZ signing at the earliest opportunity. This would enable the signing to be included in the Highway Code such that all motorists could be expected to be familiar with it.

### **6.3. Yellow lines should be omitted in all Controlled Parking Zones**

The abolition of yellow lines in CPZs and the marking of only parking and loading bays would bring benefits for all the reasons stated in Section 5 of this paper. Crucially, the use of yellow lines, only outwith areas of zonal parking controls, would provide a clear distinction between controlled parking zone restrictions and other parking controls. The significance of a zone entry sign would become clearer to motorists and, since all bays within the zone would exhibit time plates, there would be no need to memorise details of the operating regime when entering the zone.

The original objectives of CPZs, in terms of reducing signing and improving the environment have clearly not been universally achieved to date. However, removing yellow lines from CPZs will, in itself, significantly improve visual amenity. At the same time, fewer poles and time plates will be required and, if Glasgow's experience is replicated, restrictions will be more readily understood and enforced; all at a reduced cost. This can surely only be described as a win-win option for all zonal parking controls.

**The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Glasgow City Council.**

## Notes

---

- <sup>1</sup> Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002, Diagrams 1017 and 1018.1
- <sup>2</sup> Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002, Diagrams 639,640 etc.
- <sup>3</sup> Traffic Signs Regulations 2002, Section 1, 4, Interpretation – general, ref (a)
- <sup>4</sup> Traffic Signs Manual, Chapter 5, 2003, paragraph 20.29.
- <sup>5</sup> Road Vehicles Lighting (Standing Vehicles) (Exemption) Regulations, 1955 and 1956.
- <sup>6</sup> Working Papers of the Warboys Committee, 1963, Department for Transport.
- <sup>7</sup> The History of British Traffic Signs, DfT 1999, page 39.
- <sup>8</sup> Traffic Signs Regulations and General directions 2002, Diagram 663
- <sup>9</sup> Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002, Diagram 660.4.
- <sup>10</sup> 'Double parking' refers to a vehicle parking alongside another parked at the kerbside.
- <sup>11</sup> Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002, Diagrams 1019 and 1020.1.
- <sup>12</sup> Traffic Signs Manual, Chapter 5, 2003, paragraph 20.33.
- <sup>13</sup> The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions, 2002, Diagram 1032.
- <sup>14</sup> Traffic Signs Regulations and General directions 2002, Diagram 663
- <sup>15</sup> Which? Magazine November 2005.
- <sup>16</sup> Zonal Waiting Restriction Signing: Final Report (PR/T/041/03) TRL Ltd.