

Report of Director of City Development

Report to Scrutiny Board (Sustainable Economy and Culture)

Date: 8 October 2013

Subject: RESIDENTS PARKING PERMIT CHARGES

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. At their meeting of 19 June 2013 the Executive Board resolved to progress the development of proposals to introduce a charge for the provision of residents parking permit and to consult further on the basis for developing such a proposal.
2. This report which draws on the information already contained in the above report, provides an update on the position and summarises the findings of the consultation process and other comments received.
3. It is proposed to submit a further report to Executive Board in due course to set out recommendations for further consideration.

Recommendations

4. Members are requested to note and comment on this report.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report provides Board Members with further background information in order that they may examine the proposition for introducing a charge for residents' parking permits which was presented to the Executive Board on 19 June.

2 Background information

- 2.1 Parking permit schemes form a part of the overall suite of traffic management and parking control measures that are available to the Highway Authority. They are used as part of traffic management schemes to manage parking where high demand for parking in residential areas leads to problems due to insufficient spaces being available. This can result in inappropriate parking behaviours and obstruction as well as adverse impacts on access and movement of traffic in local neighbourhoods. In some instances the issues arise because on-street parking is limited and insufficient to meet the needs of residents where they have no off-street parking facilities such as driveways. This may occur because of extraneous parking caused by the presence of significant local facilities such as shops, business and leisure amenities which generate excess parking and deprives residents of parking opportunities.
- 2.2 The introduction of a charge or fee for the amenity of a residents parking scheme can be beneficial in several ways. Firstly, it can help to offset the costs for providing the service thus allowing budgets to be utilised in other priority areas of the service. Secondly, the presence of charge for a service, which is neither a mandatory requirement nor an obligation on the Council, can help to ensure that the measures are properly prioritised and targeted at a time when there is pressure from other potentially higher priority calls for services from the available highways and traffic management budgets.
- 2.3 A Scrutiny Board review into Resident Permit Parking was conducted in 2008 and this recommended that the introduction of a charge be considered further. However, on 1st April 2009 the Executive Board resolved that no action should be taken to implement the recommendations of the review. Subsequently, with increasing pressure on Council budgets an external review of City Development Directorate funding and budgets was conducted which included considering the potential to offset the cost of some of its services. This study identified the potential for charges for residents parking permits to contribute towards budget pressures as is the case in the majority of the Core Cities group of large local authorities and many other local authorities (Appendix 1).
- 2.4 In June 2013 an initial proposal was put forward to the Executive Board Report which included the following options for consideration:
- An annual charge within the range from £35 to £70 should be made for Residents' Parking Permits
 - Alternative options for how a charge might be levied: a flat rate, an escalating fee based upon engine size

- Exemptions for Blue Badge holders and drivers of certain Low Emission Vehicles (LEVs)
- An annual charge within the same range (£35 - £70) should be made for a Visitors' Permit
- A pre-payment book of scratch cards should be made available as an alternative to the single disk Visitors' Permit at a cost of £10 for 10 cards
- No change to the existing fee for Business Permits
- Contractors' monthly permit fees to increase from £5 to £10
- Damaged, lost or stolen permit replacement fees to increase from £10 to £20

2.5 Subsequent to the Executive Board, detailed development work to initiate the consultation process and assist in formulating further recommendations to Executive Board was undertaken. This work has enabled a revised figure for the number of permits in use rather than earlier estimate previously provided in the June Executive Board. This has provided a figure of 21,374 residents and visitors parking permit presently in circulation.

2.6 Similarly, a detailed analysis of the overall total costs to the Council of having residents' parking schemes has been undertaken.

2.7 The current calculated costs (2013/14, prior to any change) for the provision and operation of residents parking permit schemes are as follows:

Scheme administration	£100,200
Capital borrowing costs	£ 56,530
	=====
Total	£ 156,730

These costs take no account of change to costs that may accrue due to revised arrangements which are detailed in the next section 3.26 of the report.

Costs associated with enforcement of the scheme have not been included. Whilst substantial these are broadly cost neutral.

2.8 In the meantime, since reporting in June 2013, the budget position has not improved and with the subsequent announcement of the Spending Review the present pressures on the Council's financial position and directorate budget pressures are set continue. As such, there remains a case for additional measures to bridge the budget gap and support the ongoing provision of highways and transportation services by meeting the ongoing costs of the residents parking schemes.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 As approved by the Executive Board on 19 June, a full consultation was conducted seeking the views of the approximately 10,500 residents/households holding permits. Ahead of the Executive Board meeting all Ward Members were also advised by letter of the intended report and that subject to approval a full consultation would be undertaken and that member feedback would be welcome which was followed up by a further e-mail on 24th July.
- 3.2 There was a high response rate to the survey, with 4,030 responses received which equated to 38.4%. In addition to this, 196 written responses and 34 telephone calls were received. An on-line petition opposing the proposal was also established. To date the petition has received 75 signatures.
- 3.3 The process and summary of the results are detailed as follows.

Consultation

- 3.4 During June initial engagement commenced with a series of Focus Groups which was held with permits holders, invited from the Parking Services database, as well as non-permit holders selected from the Citizens Panel. The objective of the four focus group sessions was to understand:
- the continued need for the Resident Parking Permit Schemes
 - the perceived value of a Residents' and a Visitors' Permit
 - the level of support for the proposed charges
 - the price tolerance for a permit
 - the degree to which permits may be purchased
 - which groups should be exempt from charges
 - what vehicles should be exempt from charges

The findings from the sessions helped to influence a questionnaire that was subsequently issued to existing permit holders.

Postal Survey

- 3.5 The survey was developed in consultation with existing permit holders and other Leeds residents in the pre-consultation focus groups. Advice and support was provided throughout the process from the Council's Communication Team and from the independent research company. Printing, postage and distribution of the survey was managed in-house.
- 3.6 Qa Research Ltd was commissioned to handle data inputting, processing, quality checking, data analysis and to provide a comprehensive written report.

- 3.7 The survey, containing 26 questions, was sent to all 10,500 permit holders in mid July. The survey was formally open from 15th July to 1st August but Qa Research was asked to include returned surveys up until 7th August to take account of a small number of delayed and late responses. In total 4,030 (38.4%) surveys were returned for analysis.
- 3.8 At the same time as the Survey was live, two additional focus group sessions were conducted where non permit holders from the Citizens' Panel were invited to offer their opinions of the proposals and asked to complete the postal survey so that a comparison could be drawn between permit holders and non-permit holders (Appendix 2).
- 3.9 Summary of the findings from the Postal Survey:
- The Residents' Permit Schemes are generally well viewed by residents with a majority (61%) feeling their scheme has made parking easier near their home.
 - Over half of all respondents (52%) indicated that they fully support the scheme however, 20% of residents responded that while they supported the schemes, improvements could be made. Of these, the highest proportion (25%) expressed a desire to see Civil Enforcement Officers enforcing the zones more stringently.
 - When asked, 65% of respondents stated that they would not like to see their schemes removed.
 - For both Residents' and Visitors' permits, the number of respondents who unreservedly indicated they would pay for the permits were in the minority (Visitors':17%, Residents': 15%). Those stating that they would not opt for a permit were 34% residents and 36% visitors. More indicated that the decision to purchase a permit would depend on the cost (Visitors': 43%, Residents': 34%).
 - 25% of those respondents who would choose not to pay for a residents' permit indicated that having no permit would have no impact on them as they could park on a driveway.
 - There was some evidence that introducing a charge may increase the parking demand upon those areas just outside the permit zone boundaries. A quarter (26%) of residents indicated they would park outside the permit zone should they choose not to have a permit.
 - In terms of costs, 58% stated the costs were too high whilst 16% of residents indicated that they are prepared to pay £35 per annum (16%) and only 4% that were prepared to pay more than £35.
 - Only 27% of respondents agreed that charging households an increased permit cost for additional vehicles would be a good idea, whilst 40% disagreed. The highest response came from the view that the additional permits should be the same charge as the first and second permit.

- The present visitor permit arrangements were supported by 78% of respondents and when asked about the possible use of Visitor scratch cards the majority of respondents (74%) indicated a preference to keep the existing Visitors' Permit disk. Concern was also raised that a charge could deter visitors.
- In terms of potential for exemptions 58% agreed that blue badge holders should be exempt from the charges. 11% of respondents are currently blue badge holders although 19% of respondents consider themselves to be disabled and 9% consider themselves to be a carer. 62% said that Low Emission Vehicles and 59% said that smaller vehicles that take up less space should not be exempt.

Additional feedback and comments

3.10 In addition to the findings of the postal survey, comments were submitted by individual permit holders and residents associations via email, letter and phone call. 230 permit holders expressed opposition to the proposals in this way and provided additional feedback across a range of topics. The most common subjects are summarised below. A summary account of the comments made is contained in Appendix 3.

- Permit holders expressed opposition to the principle of charging when the schemes had been brought in to alleviate parking problems that were not of their making. Organisations including Leeds Metropolitan University and Green Flag were named as significant problems as were some hospitals and railway stations.
- Respondents from Farsley and from the Silver Royd Estate expressed the opinion that the schemes that they lived in were no longer necessary as the original causes of the problems no longer existed. A petition was also submitted by some residents of the Claremonts area for their scheme to be reviewed.
- Many suggested that the level of enforcement in their scheme was insufficient and that additional revenue could be made if enforcement was increased or took place at other times of the day.
- Some responses noted that the proposed charges were equivalent to a substantial percentage increase in Council Tax and that the proposed starting price was too high especially for those on low incomes, on a pension or benefits, or those that had multi car families.
- Around a dozen respondents took issue with the survey itself, stating that some questions had been worded in a way that did not provide sufficient opportunity to express a true opinion.
- There was significant opposition to charges from the area around Elland Road stadium, as the scheme only operates on match days which equates to less than 30 days per year.

- 3.11 In addition further to the invitation to comment requests for information and referrals from constituents were received from 11 Ward Members. Four Ward Members and three Members of Parliament made known their opposition to the proposals.

Judicial review of London Borough of Barnet's increased parking permit charges

- 3.12 During the course of the consultation period, on 22 July, the High Court issued a ruling in the case of R (on the application of David Atfield) v London Borough of Barnet. This case had been brought on behalf of residents contesting Barnet's increase in the cost of residents' parking permits and visitor vouchers, in which the local residents argued that the price increases were not needed to cover the cost of running the permit scheme, as it was already in surplus. Barnet Council has paid the income received from parking charges into its special parking account which had generated a surplus for some years. At the end of each year, surplus from this account was transferred into the general fund which was used to fund matters such as highways and transportation investment.
- 3.13 In finding in favour of the applicant, Mrs Justice Lang ruled that Barnet had acted unlawfully when it raised permit costs to generate more money for road maintenance. The court held that as a matter of general principle, a public body must exercise a statutory power for the purpose for which it was conferred and not for any unauthorised purpose.
- 3.14 Justice Lang said that the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act "is not a fiscal measure and does not authorise the authority to use its powers to charge local residents for parking in order to raise surplus revenue for other transport purposes".
- 3.15 The judge commented that the issue is not whether or not the public body has acted in the public interest, but whether it has acted in accordance with the purpose for which the statutory power was conferred. *"Where a statutory power is exercised both for the purpose for which it was conferred and for some other purpose, the public body will have acted unlawfully unless the authorised purpose was its dominant purpose"*
- 3.16 In other words, by using the charges primarily to increase revenue, the Council went beyond its powers. It is one thing to have a surplus from the parking fund and to spend it on those matters set out in the legislation, but another to use the charges for the principal purpose of raising revenue.
- 3.17 The judge also commented that *"the authority has discretion to set charges to reflect its parking policies. It is not restricted to levying a charge only to cover the base cost of running the schemes."*
- 3.18 The legal case has confirmed that budgeting for a modest surplus was permissible, provided this related to the lawful objective for which the charge was being levied as opposed to an intention to fund other transport projects.
- 3.19 In considering the implications of this judgement, the advice of the Council's legal officers is that due regard needs to be given in the further development of the proposals.

Options for making a charge for residents parking permits

- 3.20 Taking into account the continuing budget pressures confirmed by the Spending Review, it is considered that raising an administration charge to cover the cost of the permits is appropriate and any charge levied would be compliant within the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act.
- 3.21 On this basis, the initial proposals as set out for Executive Board have been re-evaluated taking on board the information that is set out in this report. A proposal is being prepared which takes full regard of the associated costs to the authority of administering residents' parking schemes in the city as described in the following section and a forecasted take up rate based on the feedback in the survey and the experience arising from a neighbouring authority's scheme.
- 3.22 A range of possibilities for differential charges including concessions for low emission vehicles are feasible. However, given the responses received to the consultation; the prospect that any fees are likely to involve a relatively modest level of charge and the added administrative complexity it is considered that the benefits of such an approach will be limited.
- 3.23 It has been concluded that any revised proposal should remain based on a flat fee approach which is set at a level that meets anticipated costs and is fair and affordable. Any proposed costs will be calculated based on the cost of the service and the medium range of take up based on the experience from other authorities and the response to the survey. This range has varied from 25% drop out to the 50% indicated in the survey from Leeds residents (albeit that the latter figure is based around that set out in the Executive Board report).
- 3.24 Currently, residents' parking permits are renewed on a rolling three yearly cycle, However, this system does not reflect the turnover of households nor fully support the effective enforcement and management of schemes. It is therefore considered that there is a value in moving towards an annual renewal process in producing a more robust scheme for the future.
- 3.25 In moving to an annual administration fee it is deemed fair that all permits will be issued at the same time therefore not giving one area preference over another with regard to delayed charging and therefore billing will be issued simultaneously.
- 3.26 The existing calculated costs of £156,730 per annum for residents parking schemes were set out in section 2 above. On the basis of the figures contained in this report and moving to an annual renewal it is estimated that there will be additional cost of £51,078 per annum which would give a total estimated annual cost of £207,808. However, any figures would ultimately be subject to confirmation in advice provided to Executive Board. These costs are net of any enforcements costs and exclude any on-costs for general traffic management technical input to parking strategy, liaison and project feasibility.
- 3.27 On the basis of the known and forecast costs for operating the scheme it is considered that the options for setting the level of an Administration Fee should not need to be any more than a maximum £25 per annum for either residents or visitors permits. The actual level would be determined by any differentials in fee levels

between the two categories of permit and the assumptions made about the level of take up.

3.28 The survey information has also indicated that some residents may wish to have their local scheme reviewed. It is also noted that in some instances there may already be good reason for schemes to be reviewed or even withdrawn. At this stage there has been no attempt to forecast such action of requirements, it being judged best to make a decision once the new arrangements are in place and the local response is understood. Similarly future arrangements for the consideration and review of schemes and longer term policy approach to residents parking schemes may merit further consideration in due course.

3.29 In making any proposals regard will also need to be given to the administrative arrangements and fee implications for schemes in the future where the measures are introduced as a consequence of a planning requirement. The estimates provided in this report assume any administration fee would apply equally to such already established schemes.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 This report and supporting documents describe the process that has been followed in consulting on the proposals discussed in this report. As noted elsewhere in the report Ward Members were invited to make comments on the proposals.

4.1.2 No other specific consultation has been carried out in relation to this report.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.1 A full Equality Impact Assessment has been conducted and is included within the Executive Board report of 19 June on this topic. No further EDCI Assessment has been undertaken at this time.

4.3 Council Policies and City Priorities

4.3.1 The cross Council Priorities include 'Spending Money Wisely'. A proposal for charging for Residents' Parking Permits would support Directorate budgets and the continued delivery of key services by relieving the cost of managing and operating the schemes from present budgets. Whilst not intended, any surplus resulting, would be held against the costs for the provision of traffic management services from which budget residents' parking permit costs are met.

4.4 Resources and Value for Money

4.4.1 This report has no specific resource and value for money implications.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 This report has no specific legal or access to information implications.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 This report has no specific risk management implications. Processes for risk and project management form part of the arrangements for the further development of the proposals as may be subsequently directed by the Executive Board.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 This report has provided additional information to complement the report previously submitted to Executive Board in order that Members of the Scrutiny Board may consider in detail the proposals to introduce a charge for residents parking permits in the light of further consultation and the general budget situation faced by the City Council.
- 5.2 Subsequent to the Executive Board decision a comprehensive survey of residents has taken place eliciting a large response and in addition a significant number of representations have been received from individual, groups and ward members/Members of Parliament. In the course of setting up the survey a detailed re-evaluation of all the data held on permit holders has been undertaken together with a comprehensive review of the detailed budgeting and costs.
- 5.3 On the basis of the activities undertaken and re-consideration of the wider situation as set out in this report, the basis for a revised proposal is identified within this report which could form the basis of preparing proposals for future consideration by Executive Board.

6 Recommendations

- 7.1 Scrutiny Board members are requested to note and comment on this paper.

7 Background documents¹

- 7.1 The following background documents relate to this report.
- i) Parking Permit Charges, report to the Council's Executive Board, 19 June 2013
 - ii) Parking Permit Charging consultation report, Qa Research, August 2013

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

APPENDIX 1

Comparison of Parking Permit fees from other cities

Table 1: Core Cities

Authority	Annual Resident Permit Charge
Birmingham	City Centre (Jewellery Quarter) £210, rest of city currently first permit £15, second £30
Bristol	City Centre £50, rest of city currently first permit £30, second £80, subsequent £200
Leeds	Free
Liverpool	Free
Manchester	£116 to £347
Newcastle	First permit £25, second £75
Nottingham	Free except for students (£70)
Sheffield	First permit £36, second and additional permits £72

Table 2: Selected other Cities

Authority	Annual Resident Permit Charge
Leicester	<p>Residents' Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £25 • Blue Badge and Carers permit – free <p>Visitors' Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 free scratch cards p.a. • Then £1 each to a maximum of 15 in any 7 consecutive days • Free for over 60 years of age • Scratch cards are active for 48 hours
Oxford	<p>Residents' Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First & Second - £50, Third £100, Fourth £150 • Blue Badge – free <p>Visitors' Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligible to anybody over 17 in the household • 25 free scratch cards p.a. • Can apply for a second batch of 25 after 6 months - £16 • Free for anybody over 70
Southampton	<p>Residents' Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First - free (except in Zones 17 & 18 - £60 p.a.) • Second - £30 (zones 2 – 12 & 16) (free in other zones) • Blue Badge holders – free (unconfirmed) <p>Visitors' Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max 6 books of 10 p.a. @ £10 per book (zones 1 – 12 & 16) • Max 2 books of 10 p.a. @ £10 per book (zones 13 – 15) • Annual Visitors' Pass - £30 (zones 1 – 12 & 16)
Derby	<p>Residents' Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First - £25, Second - £50, • Blue Badge - free <p>Visitors' Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20p each • Max 50 at a time • Does appear to be an annual ceiling <p>Carer's Permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £25

APPENDIX 2

Control Group Comparison with Permit Holders

In August, two sessions were held with non-permit holders invited from the Citizens' Panel. The proposals were discussed and at the end of each session the invitees were asked to complete the postal survey that had been sent to the current permit holders

The Permit Holder figures relate to the 4,030 returned Postal Surveys
The Control Group figures are from the 16 attendees from the Citizens' Panel

Questions 1 to 6 and questions 11 to 13 on the Postal Survey were not applicable for the Control Group. The questions were:

- Q1. To what extent do you think the Residents' Parking Permit Scheme has made parking near your home easier for you?
- Q2a. Do you support your Residents' Parking Permit Scheme?
- Q2b. If you support your Residents' Parking Permit Scheme but think it could be improved, please write in the box below how you think it can be improved?
- Q3a. Would you prefer that the Residents' Parking Permit Scheme was removed?
- Q3b. Why do you say that?
- Q4a. How many Residents' Permits do you currently have in your household?
- Q4b. If you do not currently have a Residents' Permit, do you intend to get one in the future?
- Q5. If an annual charge was to be made for a Residents' Permit would you still choose to have one?
- Q6. If you chose not to have a Residents' Permit, what impact, if any, would it have on you and your family?
- Q11. Just to check, is a Visitors' Permit the only permit you have?
- Q12. Are you satisfied with the way that the current Visitors' Permit works for you ?
- Q13. Who currently uses your Visitors' Permit?

Q7. The proposal is that the charge for the Residents' Permit would be in the range of £35 to £70 per annum. How much would you be prepared to pay for a Residents' Permit?	Permit Holders	Control Group
The proposed starting figure of £35 is too high for my circumstances	58%	25%
I would be prepared to pay £35 per annum	16%	25%
I would be prepared to pay £50 per annum	2%	44%
I would be prepared to pay £60 per annum	0%	6%
I would be prepared to pay £70 per annum	1%	0%
Some permit holders added a 6 th option – Don't agree with any charge	5%	
No response	17%	

Q8. In some other cities a permit for a second or third vehicle in a household costs more than the first permit. How far do you agree that this would be a good idea in your area?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Strongly agree	13%	19%
Tend to agree	14%	44%
Neither agree nor disagree	11%	13%
Tend to disagree	8%	13%
Strongly disagree	32%	13%
Don't know	7%	0%
No response	16%	

Q9. How much do you think the charge for a second permit should be?	Permit Holders	Control Group
The same as the first permit	47%	19%
£1 - £10 more than the first permit	13%	44%
£11 - £20 more than the first permit	4%	25%
Greater than £20 more than the first permit	3%	6%
Double the price of the first permit	6%	0%
Some permit holders added an option – Don't agree with any charge	9%	-
Some from the Control Group added an option – Less than the first	-	6%
No response	22%	

Q10. How much do you think the charge for a third permit should be?	Permit Holders	Control Group
The same as the first permit	39%	25%
£1 - £10 more than the second permit	9%	19%
£11 - £20 more than the second permit	5%	44%
Greater than £20 more than the second permit	5%	6%
Double the price of the first permit	11%	6%
Some permit holders added an option – Don't agree with any charge	8%	-
No response	23%	

Q14. In some cities, Residents can purchase a book of tear out scratch cards instead of a single Visitors' Permit disk. Which do you feel could be more appropriate for you?	Permit Holders	Control Group
I prefer the current Visitors' Permit disk	74%	31%
I think the scratch cards would be better for me as I receive few visitors	9%	-
I think the scratch cards would be better for me as I often have more than one visitor at once	6%	-
Other	3%	-
Control Group only – Scratch cards	-	44%
Control Group only - Don't know	-	25%
No response	7%	

Q15. Would you choose to still have a Visitors' Permit even if there was a charge?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Yes	17%	63%
No	36%	6%
It would depend on the cost of the permit	43%	25%
Some from the Control Group offered no response	-	6%
No response	4%	

Q16. If you chose not to have a Visitors' Permit, what impact, if any, would it have on you and your family?	Permit Holders	Control Group
No impact, there is sufficient space for my visitors to park on my drive	13%	38%
It would be inconvenient but they would park on the nearest street outside the scheme boundary	42%	19%
My visitors would use public transport or walk	4%	0%
I think it would reduce my number of visitors	39%	25%
Other impact	18%	19%
No response	5%	

Q17. Should the Visitors' Permit be charged at the same rate as the Residents' Permit?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Yes, otherwise a resident would simply choose the cheaper of the two options	19%	38%
No, it should be cheaper	31%	44%
No, a Visitors' Permit should be free to anybody who does not have a car	39%	6%
Some from the Control Group added an option – It should be much higher	-	6%
No response	10%	

Q18. The proposal is that the charge for the Visitors' Permit would be in the range of £35 to £70 p.a. How much would you be prepared to pay for a Residents' Permit?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Less than the Residents' Permit	45%	44%
The same as the Residents' Permit	11%	19%
The proposed starting figure of £35 is too high for my circumstances	31%	6%
I would be prepared to pay £35 per annum	5%	6%
I would be prepared to pay £50 per annum	1%	13%
I would be prepared to pay £60 per annum	<1%	0%
I would be prepared to pay £70 per annum	<1%	6%
Some permit holders added an option – Don't agree with any charge	9%	-
No response	11%	

Q19. Does £10 for a book of 10 scratch cards seem reasonable to you?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Yes	15%	50%
No	61%	25%
Don't know	17%	19%
No response	7%	6%

Q20a. The proposal is to exempt Blue Badge holders, that is, people with higher levels of disability wouldn't need to pay for Residents Permits. Do you agree with this exemption?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Yes	58%	63%
No	27%	25%
Don't know	9%	13%
No response	6%	

Q20b. Are you a Blue Badge holder yourself?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Yes	11%	13%
No	87%	88%
No, but someone in my household is	2%	0%

Q21. Should exemptions or reductions be made for low emission vehicles?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Yes, they should be exempt	16%	0%
Yes, they should pay a reduced charge	11%	13%
No, they should pay the same as other vehicles	62%	81%
Some permit holders added an option – Don't agree with any charge	1%	
No response	10%	6%

Q22. Should exemptions or reductions be made for smaller vehicles that take up less space?	Permit Holders	Control Group
Yes, they should be exempt	16%	0%
Yes, they should pay a reduced charge	14%	13%
No, they should pay the same as other vehicles	59%	88%
Some permit holders added an option – Don't agree with any charge	1%	
No response	10%	

Additional to the questions that appeared in the Postal Survey – a series of background questions were asked of the Control Group

1. Do you think that these Parking Schemes are of benefit to residents in areas where parking has become a problem ?

- Yes 100%
- No 0%
- Don't know 0%

2. Have any of you, or any of your neighbours thought about asking for a Residents Parking Permit Scheme where you live?

- Yes 13%
- No 81%
- Don't know 6%

3. Did you know that the resident parking schemes in Leeds are completely free ?

- Yes 50%
- No 50%
- Don't know 0%

4. What is your first reaction to the principle of paying for the permits like they do in other cities ?

- Agree 88%
- Disagree 6%
- Don't know 6%

7. If you were going to move to an area with a parking charge would a charge of this level make you look elsewhere ?

- Yes 25%
- No 56%
- Don't know 19%

11. Do you ever visit someone, by car, who lives in a Residents Parking permit zone?

- Yes 44%
- No 56%
- Don't know 0%

12. If so, do you use their Visitor' permit?

- Yes 31%
- No 13%
- Not applicable 56%

13. Do you think having to pay for Visitors Permits would make a difference to whether people you know get one ?

- Yes 19%
- No 44%
- Don't know 31%
- No response 6%

APPENDIX 3

Summary of Additional Feedback

Detailed below is a summary of the comments and objections that were received via email, letter, phone call etc. during the consultation process. 230 permit holders made contact and the comments recorded here are in addition to the findings in the consultation report supplied by Qa Research.

Area	Number and nature of the responses from this area
LS1	Only one response was received that was identified as being from LS1.
LS3	Four responses were received from LS3 indicating that local shops have disappeared meaning that a car is no longer a luxury but that the available roadside space is usually occupied by visitors and tradesmen.
LS6	Seven responses were received in LS6, including a letter from St Chad's Residents Association which indicated that the rapid expansion of Leeds Met caused the problem. Although some considered permits to be unnecessary as most houses have drives. One resident asked whether consideration could be given to a reduced rate for Becketts Park as restrictions are only in operation for 31% of the year ?
LS7	Five responses were received from LS7. One resident of Duxbury Rise (LS7) started an online petition that attracted 75 responses of opposition to the proposals. Some responses indicated that parking for the new Arena could be an issue in the future.
LS8	Five responses were received from LS8, some suggesting that their scheme was imposed upon them and paid for by St James' hospital. Some indicated that this is a poorer area where residents may have difficulty affording the charge. It was also pointed out that there is little enforcement and that shop workers park in the area all day with no penalty.
LS9	In total there were twenty eight responses from LS9 including eleven from Stoney Rock Court Sheltered Housing complex that were primarily concerned that inability to afford a permit may mean that they receive fewer visitor whilst the limited enforcement allowed others to use the road space for free.
LS10	There was only one response from LS10 which stated that they did not ask for the zone in the first place and that the proposal was just a way of LCC to raise money
LS11	There were fifteen responses from LS11 including an invitation to speak at the Beeston Community Forum. Most of the opposition centred around the football ground and the fact that matches and events only affected 20 – 30 days per year, yet the restrictions and charges would be in force year round which already has a detrimental effect on people's lives. It was suggested that the new police station and Park and Ride site may cause problems in the future. The Forum also expressed concern about the impact on residents on low incomes and the expansion of the existing scheme.
LS12	There were only two responses from LS12 and both suggested that their scheme be removed as the Winewright factory closed a long time ago and the scheme was no longer needed.

LS14	There were only three responses from LS14. Again there were calls for a scheme to be removed as the original problems stemmed from the job centre and Council offices both of which have now moved.
LS15	There were thirteen responses from LS15 with the Crossgates Centre and the associated dual use zone being singled out as a particular problem.
LS16	Twenty six responses from residents in LS16 including a letter from the West Park Residents Association. A significant amount of correspondence came from two streets some saying that they would prefer if the scheme was removed rather than pay.
LS18	There were seven responses from LS18 including one from the residents of New Road Side. Pressure comes from commuters and shoppers with local businesses suffering as the spaces are taken up by people who are using public transport into Leeds.
LS19	There were five responses from LS19 one of which pointed out that Rawdon House had re-opened with 1000 employees and that police have been called to parking disputes. It was also said that enforcement officers only patrol when the streets are not busy.
LS20	Only four responses from LS20, some stating that planners caused some of the problems as do the railway station and TK Maxx. It was a common complaint that residents should not pay to benefit commuters.
LS22	Only one response from LS22 which asked that consideration be given to the recent Barnet Ruling
LS23	Only one response from LS23 which argued that the scheme wasn't necessary in the first place
LS25	There were fifteen responses from LS25 including letters from the residents of Coupland Road and Halliday Road. One of the major complaints was that some residents have multiple Visitor Permits which puts pressure on the space. Some said that they were all for encouraging people to visit Garforth but that additional parking is required and that enforcement is sporadic to non-existent.
LS27	There were two responses from LS27 the main point of which was "Why should those that live in RPPSs subsidise the vast majority that don't"
LS28	There were 15 responses from LS28. There was a strong feeling from residents around the former site of Tradex that their scheme was no longer necessary. However it was recognised that the area around Green Flag continued to be a problem. There was also a petition submitted calling for consideration to be given to removing the scheme from the Claremonts area. Cllrs Carter and Wood also drew specific attention to the Dawson's Corner sheltered complex.
WF3	There was one response from WF3 that contained suggestions for parking improvements
Anon	There were 54 responses from residents who did not identify which part of the city they live in

Summary of the Points Raised:

The opinions that were most commonly expressed were:

- Any charge is unfair
- The proposed starting price of £35 is too high or unjustifiable
- The scheme should be removed as it is either no longer necessary, is inconvenient or is not worth the proposed cost
- Current enforcement is inadequate
- The most vulnerable residents will find it more difficult to pay which may have a detrimental effect on their home life

The Current Scheme

- The Residents' Permit Scheme is already inconvenient as it is
- The proposal to charge will not improve the service
- There are no guarantees of finding a parking space
- A charge could prevent some residents from receiving visitors
- The scheme has contributed to the loss of amenities in my area
- If anything, we should have a reduction in Council Tax contribution as a result of the inconvenience of the scheme
- Around Elland Road we only need permits approx 20 times a year – why do we pay the same as everybody else ?
- There'll be even more traffic as a result of the proposed park & ride and police station

Another Tax

- We already pay Council Tax and Road Tax – this is another tax
- The charge is the equivalent of a substantial hike in Council Tax

Charge is Unfair

- The charge is discriminatory
- Why should I pay to park outside my house
- Why should I pay when somebody 2 streets away doesn't ?
- Why should we pay when others park outside our homes for free ?
- Drivers are being targeted again

Financial Impact

- The proposed starting price of £35 is too high
- My neighbourhood is largely pensioners who would not be able to afford the proposed charge
- Any charge could make selling my house more difficult
- Any charge may limit the ability to rent my property out
- I already pay ground rent for parking
- The general cost of living has increased making life difficult
- If the proposal is that this charge would have to be paid in lump sum, some may have to resort to pay day loans
- If a charge is brought in would a refund be provided if I move out of the zone?
- We would be prepared to pay a small admin charge for a FREE permit

Avoidance

- There is a concern that some neighbours will park in their gardens to avoid paying the charge. This could cause issues such as collapsed drains

Principle

- Any charge should only cover the cost of the scheme not produce revenue
- If we'd have known there would one day be a charge we would have never agreed to the scheme in the first place
- Why should renewals be every year ? – Renewing annually is unnecessary and the cost of administration would be reduced if renewals were less frequent – every three years as it is currently.
- It should not be a one size fits all for every scheme. Each scheme is different.
- Residents will be charged to park where they live yet commuters who were the initial cause of the problem will park at no charge in the free car parks
- A car is not a luxury anymore. Poor public transport, the closure of local amenities, an aging population requiring care and different work patterns mean that the car is a necessity.
- Leeds City Council will spend the income on “silly schemes”

Operation of the Scheme

- Enforcement is insufficient, poor, non-existent and comes at the wrong time of day
- The scheme was imposed on us / we were never consulted and didn't want the scheme in the first place
- The scheme in our area is no longer necessary (eg. Around former Tradex / Winewright / Council Office near Baileys Hill)
- We don't believe there would be a parking issue if the scheme was removed
- LCC did not fund our scheme
- All of the schemes should be scrapped – this will save the cost of administration, maintenance and enforcement
- We struggle to find a parking space as it is so why should we pay
- We don't receive any annual maintenance in the zone where I live – there are no lines to maintain
- A limit should be placed on the number of permits allowed in a scheme – this would provide more of a guarantee of a parking space
- We live in a dual use zone where there is free limited parking for shoppers etc. This makes it very difficult to find a space
- Taxis park up reducing the space available. They leave engines running causing air and noise pollution and Civil Enforcement Officers do nothing
- Some residents keep their caravans on their drives whilst their cars block the road
- Some health professionals are reluctant to visit for fear of receiving a ticket
- There should be a reporting system so that residents can notify the Parking Enforcement Office of repeat offenders

Causes of the Problem

- Green Flag
- Leeds Metropolitan University
- St James' Hospital

- Seacroft Hospital
- Crossgates Centre
- Elland Road Football Ground
- Unofficial University bus drop off point
- Halifax Building Society
- LCC Planners

Leeds City Council

- LCC should make economies elsewhere
- We already get a poor service from the Council
- LCC provides little maintenance for the road surface
- LCC doesn't provide adequate gritting in winter
- Leeds should not follow the bad example of other cities
- These proposals are already a done deal and the outcomes of this consultation will be ignored
- The minority should not have to make up the LCC shortfall
- This proposal damages the reputation of the Council
- I can see that the permit costs will rise every year
- LCC should pay attention to the High Court vs Barnet Council Ruling – any charge cannot be used to raise revenue
- We already have problems renewing permits when the renewal process is spread over 3 years. This will only get worse if renewals become annual
- The maintenance of lines and signs doesn't cost any more than the general road - but you don't charge individual streets for those
- LCC should stop wasting money
- LCC allows regular meetings of faith groups in people's homes. Many visitors can attend and this contributes to a lack of parking space
- Why do we need 99 councillors in Leeds ?
- Current Parking Services provision is inadequate. We cannot speak to anybody at the weekend or in the evening to allow additional spontaneous visitors
- Parking Services are unable to act despite being informed of parking offences

The Survey

- Survey doesn't offer sufficient opportunity to express my views
- There should have been a question which asked if we support a charge for permits
- There has been insufficient time to answer the survey. The survey window was only open 18 days
- The survey was issued during a period when many residents were away on holiday
- The survey should be put on hold pending outcome of Barnet appeal
- Equality monitoring is an intrusion

Drive ways

- The proposal penalises those without drives who are likely to be less well off
- Even those with drives complain as they sometimes choose not to use them as they are often blocked
- Some drives are narrow or steep and are difficult to park on especially for visitors
- It would be impossible for all residents to use the drives as some are shared drives

Visitors

- A single Visitors' Permit is restrictive
- We don't have sufficient visitors to warrant buying a permit
- People should be able to have visitors regardless of their ability to pay
- This is a serious worry as I am terminally ill and concerned that I may not get the visitors I require
- People in Sheltered Housing would not get visitors
- Visitors' Permits are abused at the moment - some use them permanently
- There is a concern that Care visits will decrease
- Care visits will be expensive if scratch cards are brought in
- There is a concern that it will be difficult to get tradesmen to visit if we don't buy a Visitors' Permit

Exemptions

- Don't offer exemptions for low emissions this is a car size issue
- Low emission vehicles don't get discounts anywhere else such as in NCP car parks
- LEVs already receive a discount in Road tax – this is a space issue
- Low emission cars tend to be newer – you are penalising those that can't afford a new car
- Why should people be penalised for having a larger vehicle ?
- Dispensation for disability should be wider than just blue badge holders
- Usually the more you buy of anything, the cheaper it becomes – why charge more for second / third vehicles ?
- LCC essential car users should be exempt
- I object to further exemptions for disabled drivers – they already get enough

Alternative suggestions for revenue

- There would be sufficient income from PCNs if enforced correctly
- LCC should reduce costs with increased productivity and reduced staff / waste
- Parking meters should be installed close by to increase revenue
- A charge should be made at railway station car parks
- Target Council Tax dodgers and those that don't pay road tax
- Can we suggest a 2 hour limited stay to encourage trade but discourage commuter traffic
- Suggest paid car park on waste ground on Burley Road
- Increase city centre charges to offset RPPS