



OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting to be held in Committee Rooms 6&7, Civic Hall, Leeds LS1 1UR on
Monday, 20th August, 2007 at 10.00 am

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

- P Grahame (Chair) - Cross Gates and Whinmoor
- B Anderson - Adel and Wharfedale
- S Bentley - Weetwood
- B Gettings - Morley North
- S Golton - Rothwell
- T Hanley - Bramley and Stanningley
- A Harrison - Garforth and Swillington
- W Hyde - Temple Newsam
- E Minkin - Kirkstall
- R Pryke - Burmantofts and Richmond Hill

Agenda compiled by:
Telephone:
Constitution & Corporate
Governance Services
Civic Hall
LEEDS LS1 1UR

Mike Earle
224 3209

Scrutiny Support Manager:
Peter Marrington
Tel: 3951151

A G E N D A

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded)</p>	
2			<p>EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC</p> <p>To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public</p>	
3			<p>LATE ITEMS</p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration</p> <p>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes)</p>	
4			<p>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</p> <p>To declare any personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct</p>	
5			<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p>	
6			<p>CALL -IN OF A DECISION - BRIEFING PAPER</p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.</p>	1 - 4

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
7			<p>REVIEW OF CALLED-IN DECISION - REVIEW OF PARKING FACILITIES INCLUDING ADJUSTMENTS TO PRICES</p> <p>In accordance with the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules, to review the decision of the Director of City Services taken on 2nd August to approve price increases for on street and off street parking charges.</p> <p>Enclosed are :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover report from Head of Scrutiny and Member Development • Copy of Call-In request form • Copy of Delegated Decision Form dated 2nd August 2007 of the Director of City Services, together with accompanying report to the Director of City Services upon which the Director's decision was based. 	5 - 18
8			<p>OUTCOME OF CALL-IN</p> <p>In accordance with the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules, to consider the Committee's formal conclusions and recommendation(s) arising from the consideration of the Called-In decision.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date: 20 August 2007

Subject: CALL IN OF DECISION – BRIEFING PAPER

Electoral Wards Affected:

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, an officer decision has been Called In.¹ The background papers to this particular decision are set out as a separate agenda item and appropriate witnesses have been invited to give supporting evidence.
- 1.2 This report advises the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the procedural aspects of Calling In the decision.

2.0 REVIEWING THE DECISION

2.1 The process of reviewing the decision is as follows:

- Members who have requested the Call In invited to explain their concern/reason for Call In request.
- Relevant Officer(s) asked to explain decision.
- Further questioning from the Committee as appropriate.

¹ Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Paragraph 22

3.0 OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE BOARD

- 3.1 Having reviewed the decision, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will need to agree what action it wishes to take. In doing so, it may pursue one of three courses of action as set out below:

Option 1- Release the decision for implementation

- 3.2 Having reviewed this decision, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee may decide to release it for implementation. If Overview and Scrutiny Committee chooses this option, the decision will be immediately released for implementation and the decision may not be Called In again.

Option 2 - Recommend that the decision be reconsidered.

- 3.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may decide to recommend to the decision maker that the decision be reconsidered. If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee chooses this option a report will be submitted to the decision maker.

- 3.4 In the case of a delegated decision, the report of the Scrutiny Board will be submitted to the appropriate Officer within three working days of this meeting. The Officer will reconsider his/her decision and will publish the outcome of his/her deliberations on the delegated decision system. The decision may not be Called In again whether or not it is varied.

Option 3 - Recommend that the decision be reconsidered and refer the matter to full Council if recommendation not accepted.

- 3.5 This course of action would only apply if the Overview and Scrutiny Committee determined that a decision **fell outside the Council's Budget and Policy Framework** and this determination were confirmed by the Council's Section 151 Officer (in relation to the budget) or Monitoring Officer (in relation to other policies).
- 3.6 If, at the conclusion of this meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee forms an initial determination that the decision in question should be challenged on the basis of contravening the Budget and Policy Framework, then confirmation will subsequently be sought from the appropriate statutory officer.
- 3.7 Should the statutory officer support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's determination, then the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be presented in the same manner as for Option 2. If the decision maker accepts the recommendation of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in these circumstances, then the revised decision will be published in the same manner as for Option 2 and the decision may not be Called In again. If, however, the decision maker does not accept the recommendation of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, then the matter will be referred to full Council for final decision. Decisions of full Council may not be Called In.
- 3.8 Should the appropriate statutory officer not confirm that the decision contravenes the Budget and Policy Framework, then the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would normally be progressed as for Option 2 (i.e. presented as a recommendation to the decision taker) but with no recourse to full Council in the event that the decision is not varied. As with Option 2, no further Call In of the decision would be possible.
- 3.9 However, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee may resolve that, if the statutory officer does not confirm contravention of the Budget and Policy Framework, then it should be released for implementation in accordance with Option 1.

4.0 FAILURE TO AGREE ONE OF THE ABOVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, for any reason, does not agree one of the above courses of action at this meeting, then Option 1 will be adopted by default, i.e. the decision will be released for implementation with no further recourse to Call In.

5.0 FORMULATING THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT

- 5.1 If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee decides to release the decision for implementation (i.e. Option 1), then the Scrutiny Support Unit will process the necessary notifications and no further action is required by the Board.
- 5.2 If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee wishes to recommend that the decision be reconsidered (i.e. Options 2 or 3), then it will be necessary for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to agree a report setting out its recommendation together with any supporting commentary.
- 5.3 Because of the tight timescales within which a decision Call In must operate, it is important that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's report be agreed at the meeting.
- 5.4 If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee decides to pursue either of Options 2 or 3, it is proposed that there be a short adjournment during which the Chair, in conjunction with the Scrutiny Support Unit, should prepare a brief statement proposing the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's draft recommendations and supporting commentary. Upon reconvening, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be invited to amend/ agree this statement as appropriate (a separate item has been included in the agenda for this purpose).
- 5.5 This statement will then form the basis of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's report (together with factual information as to details of the Called In decision, lists of evidence/witnesses considered, Members involved in the Call In process etc).
- 5.6 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is advised that there is no provision within the Call In procedure for the submission of a Minority Report.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the contents of this report and to adopt the procedure as detailed within it.

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date: 20 August 2007

Subject: REVIEW OF CALL IN DECISION – REVIEW OF PARKING FACILITIES INCLUDING ADJUSTMENTS TO PRICES

Electoral Wards Affected:

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 This paper presents the background papers to a decision which has been Called In in accordance with the Council's Constitution.¹

1.2 Papers are attached as follows:

- Copy of completed Call In request form
- The Delegated Decision Notification.
- A report to the Director of City Services dated 20th July 2007.

1.3 Appropriate Members and/or officers have been invited to attend the meeting in order to explain the decision and respond to questions.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to review this decision and to determine what further action it wishes to take.

¹ Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Paragraph 22

This page is intentionally left blank

CALL IN REQUEST

A Call In request may be made by two Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee from different political parties.

Date of decision publication: 3rd August 2007


Delegated decision ref: D32828
or

Executive Board Minute no: or

Area Committee Name and decision ref:

Decision description: "The Director of City Services approved the price increases for on street and off street parking charges."


The following signatories request that the above decision be called in.

1) Signature  Group Labour.....

Print name Councillor Ted Hanley

Reasons for Call In:

This is yet another price rise which will mean that customers are now paying almost 100% more to park than they were two years ago and as such is unacceptable and has been made without the consultation of elected members.

2) Signature 

Group Morley Borough Independents

Print name Councillor Bob Gettings

Reasons for Call In (if different from above) As Above

This page is intentionally left blank

DELEGATED DECISION NOTIFICATION

REF NO ¹
D32828

SERVICE AREA

City Services

SUBJECT ²

REVIEW OF PARKING FACILITIES INCLUDING ADJUSTMENTS TO PRICES

DECISION ³

COUNCIL FUNCTION <input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE DECISION (KEY) <input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE DECISION (MAJOR) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE DECISION (OTHER) <input type="checkbox"/>
NOT SUBJECT TO CALL IN	⁴ EXEMPT FROM CALL IN: YES / NO	⁴ EXEMPT FROM CALL IN: YES / NO	NOT SUBJECT TO CALL IN

- The Director of City Services approved the proposed price increases for on street and off street parking charges.

AFFECTED WARDS

Changes to proposed parking charges are mostly prevalent in the City Centre and Beckett Street area.

ADVICE SOUGHT

	Yes	No
Legal		<input type="checkbox"/>
Finance	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Equal Opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other (please specify)		

¹ This reference number will be assigned by Constitution and Corporate Governance Unit and notified to you

² A brief heading should be inserted

³ Brief details of the decision should be inserted. This note must set out the substance of the decision, options considered and the reason for deciding upon the chosen option, although care must be taken not to disclose any confidential or commercially sensitive information. Guidance on the substance of the note is available from Constitution and Corporate Governance Unit

⁴ For Key and Major decisions only. If exempt from Call In details to be provided in the report. The Call In period expires at 5.00 pm on the 5th working day after publication. Scrutiny Support will notify decision makers of matters called in by no later than 12.00 noon on the 6th day.

[Empty box]

DECLARED OFFICER / MEMBER INTERESTS⁵

[Empty box]

DISPENSATION BY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

DATE:

BACKGROUND PAPERS⁶

REVIEW OF PARKING FACILITIES INCLUDING ADJUSTMENTS TO PRICES - 2007/8

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

YES NO 4 RULE NO 10.4⁷ ()

DETAILS OF CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN (OTHER REASONS/ ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED)

	Yes	No	Date
Executive Member	y		July 2007
Ward Councillors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Chief Officers Affected	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Others (Specify) <input type="checkbox"/>			

CONTACT PERSON

Graham Wilson/Mark Jefford

CONTACT NO

51501/52200

AUTHORISED SIGNATORY⁸

	DATE 2 nd August 2007
---	-------------------------------------

	KEY	MAJOR	OTHER
⁹ *First publication (5 day notice)			
Commencement for Call In		3/8/07	
Last date for Call In		10/8/07	
Implementation Date		13/8/07	

* If key decision not on Forward Plan, the reason and need that the decision be taken are that:

⁵ No officer having a pecuniary interest in any matter should take a decision in relation to that matter. Other interests of a non-disqualifying nature should be recorded here.

⁶ A separate Index should be prepared if necessary. ALL DOCUMENTATION UPON WHICH THE DECISION WAS BASED MUST BE RETAINED AND BE READILY ACCESSIBLE SO IT CAN BE PRODUCED SHOULD THE DECISION BE CHALLENGED

⁷ Access to Information Procedure Rules

⁸ The signatory must be duly authorised by the Director to make the decision in accordance with the Department's scheme. It is not acceptable for the signature to be 'pp' for an authorised signatory. For Key Decisions only, the date of the authorised signature signifies that, at the time, the Officer was content that the decision should be taken. However, should representations be received following public availability of reports the signatory will consider the effect which such representations should have upon the final decision.

⁹ Constitution and Corporate Governance Unit will enter these dates

REPORT TO THE DIRECTOR OF CITY SERVICES

DATE: 20th July 2007

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF PARKING FACILITIES INCLUDING ADJUSTMENTS TO PRICES

Electoral Wards Affected:	Specific Implications For:
ALL	Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/>
	Women <input type="checkbox"/>
	Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/>
Eligible For Call In <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Eligible For Call In <input type="checkbox"/> <small>Details Contained In The Report</small>
Major Decision ✓	Key Decision

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of the report is to inform the Director that a review of parking facilities has been undertaken, to identify trading conditions in parking and seek authority to increase some of the charges from 1st October 2007.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 There are 2 main objectives in this review of car park tariffs :

- To rationalise a complicated charging structure
- To achieve the 3% annual increase in gross income that is contained in the Parking Services budget.

2.2 The Council faces severe budgetary pressures in 2007/08, and increases in revenue from parking charges help avoid other changes such as a rise in Council Tax or cuts in services. However, it is recognised that this is not a captive market, and we are subject to market forces and external influences beyond the Council's control. A review of private sector charges has been undertaken, which indicates that the council will remain cheaper than other providers overall.

2.4 Income from parking is derived from both on-street and off-street (in car parks) parking places. Different tariffs are imposed within these parking areas to differentiate between areas of high turnover, short stay parking use and long stay commuter parking.

2.5 The review has also sought to simplify the charging regime to make it easier for customers. There are currently 5 main price bands in force in the city on street, and with small variations (for example a different Saturday charge) this rises to 12. The current system is shown on map 1. It is intended to reduce this to three bands.

2.6 Several off street car parks will also be rationalised into one price category as city centre long stay. Because of the individual characteristics of the other sites it is not appropriate to merge them into a unified fee structure. For example, the Markets is now the Council's only car park in the shopping district, Woodhouse Lane is the only staffed

car park, and Kirkstall Road is further from the city centre than any other fee paying car park.

3.0 On Street

3.1 A review of other core cities shows that everywhere except Newcastle operates a simplified system with two or three bands. It is proposed to bring on street charges into 3 bands on street according to geographical area as on map 2. This simplifies the system and uses natural boundaries such as the river and the loop wherever possible. This will allow a simple colour coded system to be implemented and advertised. If accepted, a professional map will be prepared for publication on the website and other publicity material. Any expansion of on street parking should be easy to slot in to this framework. For the purpose of this report, the three zones are as follows :

- Central
- North & West
- South & East

3.2 A review of core cities shows that 20 minutes parking in Leeds is already more expensive than anywhere else at 80p. However, a tapering effect means that the charge for 1 and 2 hours are relatively less expensive at £2.20 and £4 respectively. A review of usage shows that there is robust demand in the central area and therefore a removal of the taper is recommended.

3.3 In North & West zone, it is proposed to alter the tariffs to bring slight differences into line – currently streets in the West zone are 10p an hour more expensive than the North Zone. Merging the two will also mean the maximum stay restrictions are affected – there is a 5 hour maximum in the North zone but not in the West zone. It is proposed to remove the maximum stay restriction in the North zone. This is considered appropriate for the following reasons :

- Only 3 streets (with 97 spaces) are affected
- There is considerable capacity (the average usage is less than half the Leeds average)
- Short stay will continue to be available
- There is further short stay capacity available nearby

3.4 Demand is weaker in South & East so an increase is not recommended.

3.5 The following tariffs are proposed :

- Central area – 80p for every 20 minutes with a maximum stay of 2 hours
- North & West - £1.30 for 1 hour, £2.60 2 hours, £3.50 5 hours, £6.80 over 5 hours
- South & East – 80p for every 2 hours with a maximum stay of 10 hours

This should generate an extra £22,000 in the central zone and £5000 in the North & West zone during this financial year.

3.6 There are two areas where very specific local conditions apply due to the proximity of banks. This means that slight alterations in times are required. Pro – rata, prices are the same as other streets in the zone:

- Central zone – Russell Street (7 spaces) : maximum stay 40 minutes
- North & West zone – Grove Street (8 spaces) : additional 30 minute band

3.7 Saturday charges

There are a number of variations in charging regimes and standardisation within the zones will mean significant changes. In the majority of the spaces in the city, there is a minimum stay of 5 hours for £2.50. This is a disincentive to the short stay motorist, who will either park elsewhere or feel resentful at having to purchase so much unused time. However, part of the central zone is chargeable at a rate of £1.80 per hour. A review of usage shows that neither tariff attracts a great deal of use on Saturdays.

A unified structure is proposed which introduces an hourly rate across the city, and introduces a slight increase in the longer stay tariffs. Due to the weak demand it is considered more sensible to drop the rates in the hourly charge areas than to raise them in the other areas. The cumulative effect is to improve prices for short stay users across the city, and offer more competitive long stay prices on the outskirts of the centre. The following tariffs are proposed :

- Central area - £1.50 for 1 hour, £3 for 5 hours.
- North & West - £1 for 1 hour, £2.50 for 5 hours, £3.50 for over 5 hours
- South & East – 50p for 1 hour, £2 for 5 hours, £3 for over 5 hours

It is estimated that these changes will lead to increased revenue of £10,000.

4.0 Off Street

4.1 City centre Long stay.

At present, there are small price differences between these car parks as below.

	Monday – Friday				Saturday	
	1 hr	2 hr	5 hrs	Over 5 hrs	5 hr	Over 5 hrs
Meadow Lane	£1.20	£2.40	£3.20	£6.40	£2.50	£3.50
Hunslet Lane	£1.20	£2.40	£3.20	£6.40	£2.50	£3.50
West Street	£1.20	£2.40	£3	£6	£2.50	£3.50
Quarry Hill	£1.30	£2.40	£3.50	£6.80	£2.50	£3.50
Claypit Lane	n/a	n/a	£3.50	£6.80	£2.50	£3.50
Maude Street *	n/a	n/a	£3.50	£3.50	£3.50	£6.80

* Maude Street is technically the public highway and therefore “on street” but is treated as “off street” as it is arranged in the same way as a car park.

There were no price rises in these car parks in the last year. It is clear that there is increased demand in Meadow Lane, Hunslet Lane & West Street so a small increase of 10p an hour is appropriate. This also brings prices into line with the other car parks.

Saturday charges have not increased for 18 months and a small increase is appropriate, from £2.50 - £2.70 for 5 hours and £3.50 - £3.90 for over 5 hours. In addition, as with on street, the requirement to purchase a minimum of 5 hours parking is as disincentive for short stay use so a new one hour band is proposed. The Maude Street Saturday charge is out of line with the others and will be reduced.

	Monday – Friday				Saturday		
	1 hr	2 hr	5 hrs	Over 5 hrs	1 hr	5 hr	Over 5 hrs
Current	Various prices – see above				N/A	£2.50	£3.50
Proposed	£1.30	£2.60	£3.50	£6.80	£1.50	£2.70	£3.90

This should generate additional income of £25,000

4.2 **Woodhouse Lane Multi-storey**

The closure of Portland Crescent has increased demand at this car park, and ongoing investment has improved the facility. Therefore a small increase of 10p an hour is appropriate on both weekdays and Saturdays.

	Monday – Friday			Saturday	
	2 hr	5 hrs	Over 5 hrs	5 hrs	Over 5 hrs
Current	£2.60	£3.50	£6.80	£2.50	£3.50
Proposed	£2.70	£3.70	£7	£2.70	£3.90

This should generate an extra income of £17,000.

4.3 **Burley Road**

Burley Road is currently about half its usual size due to adjacent building works. The loss of spaces have led to it becoming full on frequent occasions. Although it is located nearby, Kirkstall Road is much less popular. Currently prices are the same for short stay and slightly cheaper (£4 rather than £5) for all day parking in Kirkstall Road. A small increase of 10p an hour on Burley Road is proposed, which should increase revenue and encourage greater use of Kirkstall Road, where prices will be frozen.

	Monday – Friday					Saturday	
	2 hrs	4 hrs	6 hrs	8 hrs	10 hrs	5 hrs	Over 5 hrs
Current	£1	£2	£3	£4	£5	£2.50	£3.50
Proposed	£1.10	£2.20	£3.30	£4.40	£5.50	£2.70	£3.90

In addition, permit prices have been frozen at £174 for 2 years. In this time the general tariff has been raised twice. Therefore a rise is appropriate, from £174 a quarter to £200.

This should raise an estimated £12,000 in this financial year, £10,200 in fee income and £1800 in permits.

4.4 **Beckett Street**

Due to its location, Beckett Street is almost wholly used by hospital visitors. As the hospital also provide parking nearby their charges are an important comparator. Currently their prices are £1 an hour as compared with 70p in Beckett Street. An analysis of usage of this car park shows that it is the busiest Council facility by about 40% (in terms of numbers of hours purchased per bay). Even allowing for the fact that it is in demand 7 days a week, this indicates that it is near to capacity. A 20p per hour rise would ensure that it remains cheaper than NHS facilities whilst addressing the over demand.

Charges in force 7 days a week						
	1 hr	2 hrs	3 hrs	4 hrs	5 hrs	Over 5 hrs
Current	70p	£1.40	£2.10	£3	N/A	N/A
Proposed	90p	£1.80	£2.70	£3.60	N/A	N/A
NHS rate	N/a	£2	£6	£6	£6	£12

This should raise an additional £16,000 this year.

4.5 **Otley**

No changes are planned in the Otley car parks.

4.6 The additional revenue arising from these selective changes will amount to:

On Street	37,000
Beckett Street	16,000
Burley Road	12,000
City Centre long stay	25,000
Woodhouse Lane	17,000
Total	£107,000

5 RISKS

It is by no means certain that the proposed increases will result in the income reported above. This analysis was based on previous experience but the following factors may impede this outcome :

- Previous price rises in April have led to less demand for parking and lower than expected returns
- As a result some car parks actually take less income than in the previous financial year.
- The price differential between inner city Council car parks and the private sector used to be about 40%. It is now less than 10% in some areas. This is important because the private sector offer better car parks in terms of security, lighting , surface and general appearance.
- There are between 2000 – 3000 spaces in outer city car parks (mostly without planning permission) in direct competition with Council facilities at much lower prices.
- With no significant capital investment for several years the Council's car parks are steadily deteriorating.

6.0 WARD MEMBERS AND/OR OTHERS CONSULTED

6.1 The Executive Member for City Services has been consulted on the content of the report. Executive Board have approved the overall level of increase in parking charges as part of the proposals for the 2006/07 budget.

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Funding: The cost of conversion of the tariff mechanisms on Pay and Display machines, revised signing and stationary and advertising of the Parking Place Orders necessary to implement those revised charges and the time banding arrangements, will be funded from the Department's revenue estimates.

7.2 Staffing: There are no staffing implications arising from the proposals.

8.0 SPECIFIC IMPLICATIONS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES, WOMEN OR DISABLED PEOPLE'S GROUPS

8.1 There are no specific implications for ethnic minorities or women. Vehicles displaying a Disabled Person's Badge (Blue Badge) and conveying the person to whom the badge was issued are able to park free of charge all day in the areas covered by the proposal.

9.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR CORPORATE AND DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES

9.1 The proposed charges are consistent with the Parking Strategy advocated in the Environmental policy.

Mobility: See comment in 6.2 above


There are no implications for other Corporate Policies of the Council
The proposed charges are consistent with the Parking Strategy advocated in the Leeds Transport Strategy and in line with the parking element of the Government guidelines on an integrated transport strategy.

10 **Conclusions**

- 10.1 Following the review of parking charges it is considered appropriate to amend and change tariff bands on some charges whilst maintaining others at current levels.

11.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 11.1 The Director of City Services is requested to approve the revised charges/changes outlined in this report.



- Central short stay
- North & West
- South & East

MAP 2 – PROPOSED CHANGES

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

DRAWING NUMBER: **TFZ7-4**

DATE: **APRIL 2005**

SCALE: **N.T.S.**

DESIGN	CHECK	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE

G:\TRAFFIC\PROJECTS\TRM\PC_SOUTH\MISCELLANEOUS\VIEW-PARKING\VFZ7-4.DWG
PLOTTED BY: HOBNO-C DATE: 04/04/05