

---

**Report of the Chief Environmental Services Officer and Director of City Development**

**Scrutiny Board City Development**

**Date: 14<sup>th</sup> October 2008**

**Subject: Resident Parking Schemes**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

Citywide

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

---

**1 Purpose of the Report**

1.1 To provide the City Development Scrutiny Board with an overview of the process for the introduction of Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) with particular reference to:-

- Any information requested from the 1st session,
- The way in which the suggestion that residents be allowed to fund such schemes themselves would work in practice, particularly with regard to funding and enforcement,
- How revenue might be raised to offset the costs to residents. For instance, there could be scope in an area where a large proportion of residents were commuters to release spaces during the day for 'pay and display' parking by non-residents,
- Evidence from local Ward Councillors and individuals who have applied for resident parking and identified in Session 1, and
- Best practices from other local authorities,

**2 Information requested from the 1<sup>st</sup> Session.**

2.1 The following questions/comments were raised at the 1<sup>st</sup> session which require a response:-

- i) limit the number of resident parking permits issued on a street - what do other local authorities do?
- ii) further comments on abuse of permit system?
- ii) why issue 3 year parking permits as opposed to annually? - introduce an annual charge (like Richmond on Thames) for residents that is self financing and no cost to the Council rate fund
- iv) why have we not withdrawn any residents parking scheme in the city - what monitoring is done?
- v) confirm that enforcement of residents parking schemes is a neutral cost - self financing

- 2.2 **Limit the number of Parking Permits Issued:** - The issue of limiting the number of permits is considered in Section 5 of this report.
- 2.3 **Abuse of the Permit System:** – As outlined in the initial report, some areas are vulnerable to permit fraud. This usually involves a visitor's permit being used by person who is not visiting, usually a commuter, to park for free where there is either no public parking available, or where alternative parking is chargeable. There have been instances of businesses leafleting addresses offering to purchase permits, and also permits being sold as contract parking on websites.
- 2.4 The problem is tackled in a number of ways. An information sheet is sent out with all permits, which contains the following advice :
- “A visitor's permit can only be used by visitors to your property. If it is used for any other reason a Penalty Charge notice will be issued. The permit facility may be withdrawn if permits are found to have been misused “*
- 2.5 Permits have a reference number which enables them to be linked to the relevant address. The enforcement section keeps a list of all lost, stolen and cancelled permits which is issued to all Civil Enforcement Officers. Other suspicions about a particular permit arise in a number of ways :
- Referred by the public
  - Vehicle arrives or leaves at the same time every day
  - Vehicle is parked a considerable distance from the relevant property
  - Driver walks in the wrong direction when leaving the vehicle
  - The vehicle appears expensive compared to others in the zone
- 2.6 In these cases, an attendant is sent out to check, and a Parking ticket is issued once there is enough evidence to do so - this is usually when the driver is seen leaving the vehicle and going into their place of work. This is followed up by a letter to the permit holder advising that an offence has been committed and that a further offence will lead to the permit being cancelled. This usually deals with the problem and only 4 or 5 permits are cancelled per year.
- 2.7 In addition, the Council also carries out one off operations with other agencies such as the Police and area management. This involves a check on all vehicles parked in the zone, with every permit checked and some home visits carried out to the relevant addresses.
- 2.8 The section has recently (beginning in September) begun a pilot scheme to look at the level of fraud, not just in residents zones but also involving misuse of blue badges. This involves using officers in plain clothes to observe parking areas. This will be extended if there are sufficient numbers of offences.
- 2.9 **Issuing of 3 Year Permits:** - Permits are currently issued on a three year cycle to avoid annual administrative costs which are not covered by an existing budget. Should the option to introduce a charge for permits be taken up then the system would be changed to administer the permits on an annual basis or for the duration of a tenancy agreement if less than a year and the cost of the permit would reflect the administrative costs incurred.
- 2.10 **Withdrawal and Monitoring of RPPS:** - To date, no RPPS has been withdrawn. The Traffic Engineering Section, which investigates the demands for RPPS have not been requested to consider withdrawing any schemes. Particularly with there being no charge for a permit, residents in areas where a scheme may not now be required might consider that the permit provides them with a degree of security in obtaining a parking space. Also, where the original need for a scheme was due to, say, a local factory, which may have closed, residents may prefer to wait and see what new development takes the place of the factory.
- 2.11 Traffic Engineering has reviewed some schemes when Parking Services have advised that enforcement will become difficult due to markings and/or signs having become in need of maintenance. This recently occurred in the Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward.

- 2.12 Traffic Engineering has also been involved in the proposed RPPS adjacent to St James hospital. Within the area identified for a RPPS there are existing schemes in operation and the opportunity will be taken to consult with residents on their operation and, if supported, bring them into a larger scheme.
- 2.13 **Confirm that Enforcement of RPPS is Cost Neutral** - It is not possible to give a robust figure for expenditure because there are no staff members who deal solely with permit issues. For example, enforcement is carried out on a beat system with each beat containing a number of different roads with different restrictions. About 16.5 % of Parking Tickets are issued in residents' areas, and it is fair to say that the majority of work carried out by both the Enforcement team and the back office is related to parking tickets. Therefore, in order to calculate a figure, obviously unrelated costs (for example, car park rates & maintenance) have been removed and 16.5 % of the relevant costs calculated. For 2007/08, this gives the following :

<b>Staffing</b>	£342,000
<b>IT, stationery, postage, telephones</b>	£38,000
<b>Other</b>	£51,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£431,000</b>

- 2.14 With regard to income, it should be noted that it is not legal to set income targets for Penalty Charges. The Government guidance states :

*“For good governance, enforcement authorities need to forecast revenue in advance. But raising revenue should not be an objective, nor should authorities set targets for revenue or the number of penalty charges they issue.*

*The judgement in R v LB Camden (ex parte Cran) made clear that authorities should not enforce orders made under the RTRA exclusively to raise revenue”.*

- 2.15 Therefore the primary purpose of any traffic order must be traffic management. Penalty Charges are supposed to be imposed to deter illegal parking, not to fund schemes.
- 2.16 An analysis of penalty charges issued in 2007/08 is given below. It should be noted that the cancellation rate for tickets issued in residents' zones is 37% against a normal cancellation rate for Parking Tickets of 11%. The reason that it is much higher here is because the service takes a lenient view of incidents where a genuine resident or visitor does not display their permit. So these tickets have been legally issued and are legally enforceable but the service has decided not to pursue them. It can take over a year to recover a parking fine and some additional income is expected from these cases, this has been estimated.

<b>Residents zone tickets</b>		<b>% of total</b>	<b>Income</b>
Issued	20,128		
Paid	10,354	51 %	£485,430
Cancelled	7,451	37 %	£0
Pending	2,323	12 %	£29,000*
		<b>PCN Total</b>	<b>£514,430</b>
Business permits	882		£44,100
		<b>Total</b>	<b>£558,530</b>

\* estimated

- 2.17 It must be stressed that RPPS are only cost neutral because the continuing illegal parking, which occurs in some of the areas, is detected and enforced through the parking tickets issued by Parking Services. There may be zones where there is no abuse of the scheme, perhaps because regular parkers all know that the level of enforcement is high and they will get caught! Hence, while it is possible to demonstrate that operation of the schemes overall is cost neutral,

this may not be the case for each specific scheme and there are no guarantees that income from tickets will continue to cover operational costs.

### **3 The way in which the suggestion that residents be allowed to fund such schemes themselves would work in practice, particularly with regard to funding and enforcement.**

- 3.1 The Scrutiny brief specifically asked for this area to be investigated. RPPS take a significant length of time from injection into the Traffic Engineering work programme to actual delivery on site. There appears to be a perception that schemes could be fast tracked if external funding were available.
- 3.2 It has been identified in paragraph 4.5 and 4.6 of the report to the 1<sup>st</sup> session that a RPPS may not be the most appropriate measure to address the parking problem. Should residents be permitted to fund a RPPS they may consider that a scheme should be provided irrespective of agreed criteria for providing a RPPS in other areas or advice provided by officers. If the scheme was provided but didn't meet the expectations of the community consideration would have to be given to resolving the situation, but at a cost to whom and what priority?
- 3.3 For this to work the Council needs to have a strong and clear policy on where RPPS will be provided. To avoid the installation of inappropriate RPPS, only schemes which fall within the policy should be progressed. It is inadvisable to give residents a remit to have what they want because they are paying, when they don't necessarily have the right information to make the right decision.
- 3.4 Paying for a scheme will not necessarily accelerate its delivery. In treating our customers fairly, it is wrong to accelerate a low priority scheme in advance of an area where residents are experiencing severe parking issues. The potential for groups of residents to be able to fund the investigation, consultation, legal process, design and implementation of a RPPS may discriminate against members of society unable to afford such a scheme but who may be in greater need.
- 3.5 Section 5 of the report to the previous meeting identified the range of timescales for the introduction of RPPS. It is a lengthy process, particularly with the uncertainty around consultation and overcoming objections, and will not be shortened simply because the funding is coming from a different source.
- 3.6 However, it would enable, because funds are limited, for more schemes to be injected into the programme. While staff resources are also limited, the option is available to give the work to the partner.
- 3.7 The Traffic Section has a finite staff resource to deliver a specific programme of work for the year while at the same time considering schemes for subsequent years. Introducing additional schemes into an agreed programme requires either existing programmed schemes to be given a lower priority or additional staff recruited. It is likely that the Councils' consultant partner, Mouchels, would be used to provide that additional staff resource.
- 3.8 Any schemes promoted in this way will be subject to the same legal / enforcement arrangements. This does mean that residents could agree to fund the partners' fees, only for the scheme to be abandoned on receipt of valid objections which cannot be over-ruled.

3.9 A summary of the above issues is shown in the table below.

FOR	AGAINST
Releases other funding.	Could be seen as discriminatory.
Develops use of consultant partner.	RPPS may not be most appropriate measure but will be expected by residents if they are funding. Who would fund any future changes?
	Staff resource to deliver scheme.
	Residents may not agree on scheme required and raise objections.
	May not be a priority within Traffic programme.

3.10 Allowing residents to fund such schemes themselves will work well for injecting additional funding into the programme and allowing more schemes to be progressed. But officers would strongly recommend that it is only used for schemes which fall within the policy. It would be inequitable for it to become a means of promoting inappropriate or low priority schemes in advance of high priority and will not necessarily reduce the time required to implement a scheme.

**4 How revenue might be raised to offset the costs to residents. For instance, there could be scope in an area where a large proportion of residents were commuters to release spaces during the day for ‘pay and display’ parking by non-residents,**

4.1 An alternative to residents paying for the implementation of a scheme is to recover the costs once the scheme is established and residents are gaining its benefits.

4.2 Currently, no charge is made to residents for permits unless they are lost and need replacing. But this Scrutiny inquiry has raised the question of whether a charge should be made and this is explored in subsequent paragraphs. This section also considers other possible means of recovering implementation and on-going operational costs.

4.3 The issue of whether or not to charge for parking permits is widely debated and the varying methods used by other local authorities is considered from paragraph 4.4 to 4.16. Income estimates have been based on the existing 9,900 residents permits issued. However some residents may rarely use their visitor pass and a significant proportion may select not to pay or may reduce their permit requirement for other reasons.

**4.4 ‘At Cost’ charge.**

4.5 It has been shown in Paragraph 2.13 that the administrative costs for RPPs are in the order of £431,000. The following table shows, in column 1, the annual charge required to cover the cost of administering the issuing of permits; in column 2, the charge required to cover the administration and estimated maintenance; and, in column 3, the charge required to cover the administration, maintenance and average implementation costs spread over 5 years. After 5 years the annual charge would reduce.

Annual Charge to cover administrative costs.	Annual Charge to cover Admin and Maintenance	Annual charge to cover Admin. Maintenance and Implementation
£45	£65	£105, reducing after 5 years

#### 4.6 Charge relative to CO2 Emissions or Engine size

4.7 Some authorities, notably London Boroughs, relate the cost of a permit to either the Carbon Dioxide emissions or engine size of the vehicle, depending upon when the vehicle was first registered. Vehicles with low emissions or an engine size under 1000cc are either free or have a minimal charge. Larger vehicles can incur charges up to £300 per year.

4.8 The following table shows, based upon the percentage of vehicles licensed in 2007 with engines of certain sizes from the 'Vehicle Licensing Statistics 2007' related to the current number of resident permits issued. Charges have been selected at random for exemplification.

Engine CC	% of Vehs	No. of resident Permits	Possible Charge (£)
Under 1000	4%	396	Free
1001 - 1550	31%	3,069	50
1551 - 2000	51%	5,049	75
2001 - 2500	7%	693	150
2501 - 3000	4%	396	200
Over 3001	3%	297	250
Total		9,900	

4.9 As with all charging options, any excess income may be redirected back towards the cost of introducing the scheme.

#### 4.10 Equal Charge per Vehicle

4.11 Irrespective of the number of vehicles registered to an address, each vehicle incurs the same charge. Again, to cover the cost of administering the issuing of permits would require a charge of approximately £50 per year for every permit issued, though this cost could be varied.

#### 4.12 Escalating charge per Vehicle

4.13 As the number of vehicles registered to a property increases so the cost of the permit increases. It would be possible for the first permit to be free with rising charges for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> vehicles.

4.14 The traffic order would describe whether permits are issued per household or per address and this could have major implications for houses of multiple occupancy. A property divided into, say, 6 flats could require 6 permits for residents. The first applicant would receive a free permit; the 2<sup>nd</sup> and subsequent applicants would be charged at an increasing scale with or without a maximum limit. This may prove administratively complex as and when permit holders change, particularly if short term tenancies are involved. Again charges have been selected at random to exemplify this option.

No. of Vehs.	Estimated No. of Permits	Cost of Permits
1.	7,575	£0 - £30
2.	1,980	£50 - £100
3+	345	£150 - £200
Total	9,900	

#### 4.15 **Charge related to Zone**

4.16 Some authorities' zone their RPPS's so that the cost of a permit varies from zone to zone depending upon its location. This option is, administratively, more complex and generally places a higher charge on areas close to City Centres.

#### 4.17 **Visitor Permits**

4.18 Leeds currently provide visitors permits which can be used as often as needed. But some residents may have more visitors than others and anyone with infrequent visitors may not wish to purchase an annual permit. Unless this is accommodated in an equitable way, there is likely to be opposition to any charging scheme. Other authorities sell permits which are valid for just one day and this would need to be explored further if there was a decision to progress a charging strategy.

4.19 With all permit charging mechanisms there is the potential for residents to be reluctant to pay. Residents would have the opportunity during consultation to express their dissatisfaction with a permit charge and may object when the formal traffic orders are advertised. Residents who do not purchase a permit would not be able to park within the zone or scheme area surrounding their property and be liable to receive a fixed penalty notice (FPN). Unable to park in the zone they would have to park in the nearest street outside of the zone. Unless the scheme operated 'first come – first parked' RPPS would not work well where there were too many residents' cars for the length of kerb. Hence schemes may only be acceptable if residents were effectively guaranteed a space and this might mean restricting permit numbers (see below).

4.20 There may be some positive benefits as residents change their behavior in order to avoid the charges. They might identify other off-street parking opportunities or they may review their travel modes and vehicle ownership with beneficial impacts on the overall availability of kerb space as well as on congestion and the environmental footprint of the city. In particular short stay residents such as students may choose to keep a vehicle in the area.

4.21 It is considered that any charging scheme must be applied to existing RPPS, of which there are approximately 70, as well as proposed schemes to treat every body fairly. This would necessarily lead to a review of the need for all the existing schemes and some consultation on whether residents wished to retain the scheme. There would probably be a need to phase in the charge over a period of time to give residents opportunity to make alternative arrangements if they wished to avoid the charge (and also to help manage the staff resources needed for such a review).

4.22 Importantly, while there are financial and technical implications on the question of whether or not to charge for permits, ultimately this is a political decision.

#### 4.23 **On Street Charging Mechanisms**

4.24 The alternative to residents paying for a permit is for those non-residents to the area to pay for their on-street parking. This can be achieved by either dedicating certain sections of the road for non-residents or by allowing residents and non-residents to share sections of the road, known as 'dual' or 'mixed' use bays, with priority given to residents.

4.25 Residents would be exempt from any pay and display charges and may also have sole priority for spaces between certain times, e.g. between 16.00 or 17.00 hrs and 08.00 or 10.00 hrs the following day. Paid for, on – street parking would be available outside of these hours. This enables the street to be used for controlled parking and potentially generate income. The cost of the on-street parking may vary between resident parking zones depending upon the proximity of the area to cause of the parking, the charges levied by any off-street parking in the area and the type of parking, long or short stay, which the Council may want to encourage. As such, it is difficult to estimate the potential income generation until such schemes are in operation.

4.26 Where the parking problems are caused by very short term parking for local shops, say 10 – 30 minutes, local businesses may raise concern about the future of their business if a charge was to be levied for short term parking. Parking could still be restricted by time in such a situation by introducing 'limited waiting'. This restricts parking to a set period of time with return prohibited for a

further time period. A charge does not need to be levied but strict enforcement of the times would be necessary.

- 4.27 Mixed parking is most appropriate in areas where a charge is already made for off street parking, e.g. in the vicinity of hospitals, where visitors might currently park in residential areas to avoid charges. Hence this is a good practice which officers are already seeking to implement in suitable areas.

## 5 Restrictions on Permits

- 5.1 With the number of cars per household increasing, the number of permits allowed to a household or address needs to be considered. Permits only apply to vehicles parked on the highway; a resident who has sufficient off-street parking would not need a residents' permit but may need a visitor permit. If the number of residents' permits is limited per household then vehicles in excess of this number will either have to be parked outside of the RPPS boundary or off-street. This would put pressure onto parking space in streets just outside the boundary of an RPPS, where there may not be an existing parking problem and, therefore, require the size of the RPPS to be increased. Not restricting the number of permits may mean that there is insufficient length of kerb for the number of vehicles to park and a 'first come – first parked' situation would arise with no permit holder being guaranteed a space.
- 5.2 Alternatively, the number of spaces within the RPPS could be determined and permits issued, either restrictively per household or on a 'first come basis' until the RPPS is fully allocated. Further requests would go on a waiting list until a permit was released.
- 5.3 This situation is exacerbated in locations with houses of multiple occupation. A single house converted to a number of flats could generate one or more residents' permit per flat. Again, the number of permits per flat could range from restricted (1 per flat) to unlimited (1 per vehicle registered).
- 5.4 Each RPPS is designed specifically for a defined area and, therefore, consultation with local communities would determine whether or not certain restrictions would be acceptable, these might include:-
- Restricting the number of permits per property,
  - Knowingly having insufficient spaces for the number of permits, - this may be unacceptable if a charge is levied.
- 5.5 The balance between possible charging for a permit and restricting the number of permits needs careful consideration. Any policy decisions need to be taken in conjunction with any decision to charge for permits. As with charging for permits, restricting the number of permits could have some positive benefits on vehicle use and parking behavior.
- 5.6 A sample number of local authorities, Manchester, Sheffield, Birmingham, Newcastle, Kirklees and Barrow have been contacted with the following questions:-
- 1) Do other authorities limit the number of permits per property ?
  - 2) What charging structures are in place?
  - 3) Is there any best practice we could draw from?
  - 4) What are the drawbacks of charging?
  - 5) How many zones are there?
- 5.7 The responses to these questions are in Appendix 1 of the report.



## **6 Evidence from local Ward Councillors and individuals who have applied for resident parking and identified in Session 1,**

- 6.1 Three Members provided comments to the 1<sup>st</sup> session. Their comments are included in italics below together with the officer responses. Some of the responses have been covered elsewhere but are repeated here for completeness
- 6.2 *I think the methodology for introducing TRO's, especially RPZ's, is very frustrating. So much time is given over to dealing with objectors and addressing or disproving their concerns. On recent schemes in Headingley it has dragged schemes on for many months, which is very annoying to councillors and residents who can't understand the delay. Many of the complaints are from the very commuters the RPZ is trying to deal with! On a scheme in the Granby's, which was finally implemented last year we had the above frustrations followed by the TRO being in place, but not being enforced until the signs were up on the streets. The signs couldn't be ordered until the TRO was approved and then we had to wait 6 weeks to get the signs ordered in. Then additional time to get them installed. Surely this could all have been booked and scheduled earlier in the process. On a separate note residents on the Granby's would be happy to trial a progressively priced scheme for RPZ charging as long as the first car pass was free.*
- 6.3 Officers recognise the frustration to Members and the public of the time involved in developing a RPPS. The advertising of the required Traffic Regulation Order, receiving objections, resolving the objections and ultimately Joint Highways Technical Board considering overruling the objections is part of the legal process which must be followed implicitly. RPPS are developed with local communities to try and ensure that no objections will emanate from the community. Objections do come from those motorists who park, free, in residential areas rather than pay for parking elsewhere as they recognise they will either have to find an alternative place to park, pay for parking or change their mode of transport. To date, Highways Board has overruled objections from motorists not local to the proposed scheme. Subsequent to Highways Board overruling an objection there is a 6 week period when the decision can be challenged through the High Court and officers cannot be seen to be prejudging the possibility of a challenge. Only when the authorised signs and markings are on site can enforcement be undertaken. The possibility of residents of the Granby's trialling a progressively priced scheme is noted, however as indicated in paragraph 4.21 it is considered that existing schemes would be fully reviewed if any charge for permit proposals were introduced.
- 6.4 *Paying themselves to have it set up: I think a lot of people would be very opposed - they already believe they have the whole road as a rightful place to park anyway! paying for permits would need consultation. If they paid for them themselves I would expect them to have the same legal standing and protection as the ones we set up. Needs to consider knock-on effects when commuters/students are moved out!*
- 6.5 Officers recognise that some residents may consider a permit charge as another form of taxation. All RPPS have the same legal basis, irrespective of who funds the scheme.
- 6.6 *I think the Council should have a very clear policy on where and when schemes can be put in and what those schemes are designed to do. At the moment there seems to be no uniformity in provision, i.e. people who shout loudest, have Councillors with influence in the relevant department seem to get schemes. I also think that many people ask for schemes for the wrong reason believing they have a right to park their car outside their house and that a scheme will stop anyone else parking there. I also think that schemes are not always the appropriate solution. I know Cllr Pryke did not want a list of parking problems but in Yeadon there is a problem with people parking, going to the airport and having a fortnights holiday then returning to there car. This is irritating to residents of effected streets who want residents parking permits. However waiting restrictions, (20 out of 24 hours) are much more effective in dealing with this. Similarly we could have partial schemes where there is a problem for only part of the day, e.g. 6-00pm to 6-00 am where residents are out at work all day but have problems with evening parking. Schemes should be cost neutral to the Council. People who do not have a scheme resent paying the costs for people who do. Providing a scheme meets agreed criteria there is no reason why residents should not fast track it by paying for it setting up, after all they are getting a parking space which*

*has a value. New schemes should be measured against the car parking reviews which are currently taking place. Costs could be offset by adverts on the permits. (insurance companies). This may be heresy but we should also have a mechanism for removing schemes. If it was put in place to deal with parking from a factory which closes we should ask if it is still needed.*

- 6.7 Officers indicated in the previous report that consideration of RPPS focus on residential areas with parking associated with business/retail premises, hospitals, universities, stations, public transport corridors and other more specific local parking issues. To retain flexibility in providing a RPPS, the following are situations where a RPPS would NOT currently be considered:-
- To resolve school parking problems,
  - If residents do not support it,
  - To resolve disputes between neighbours,
  - Issues of multiple occupancy of a building, and
  - If off-street parking is available to the majority of properties and sufficient space is available for parking.
  - Within new developments in the City Centre
- 6.8 Many residents, incorrectly, consider the highway in front of their property to be their own parking space when, in fact, it is public highway. Officers have recognized that early RPPS which were solely restricted for resident use have caused streets to become deserted during the daytime when they could be used for some form of controlled parking. The signing and lining of all parking restrictions are currently being reviewed across the city and locations within RPPS, where controlled parking could be introduced, will be noted for further assessment.
- 6.9 As indicated in the report to Session 1, RPPS are not always the appropriate solution and officers will advise on the most appropriate measures to address the identified problem.
- 6.10 There are two main cost elements to any RPPS; the initial design and installation processes and the ongoing permit issuing and maintenance. From recent schemes the cost of the design and installation process is approximately £200 per space with a further £30 for administration of the permit. Without extensive research into each scheme currently in operation it is difficult to determine whether or not the initial costs could be recovered through enforcement. The cost could be recovered by including it in an increased annual permit charge spread over a period of up to, say, 5 years.
- 6.11 Whether residents should fast track a RPPS by paying for its setting up is reviewed in Section 3 of this report.
- 6.12 Traffic Engineers have indicated to those undertaking the car parking reviews the locations of demand for RPPS and other known parking issues. When the reviews are reported, any proposals and/or comments in relation to RPPS will be considered.
- 6.13 The space on the back of the fee tickets is currently sold for advertising although the space doesn't always get sold. The deals obtained at the moment just cover the printing costs rather than anything more substantial. The big disadvantage of permits rather than fee tickets is that there are very few of them and there is no turnover - as the advert has to last for a year it can't refer to any special promotion etc which limits the market. To give an idea of the market, 4.5m fee tickets generate £16,500.
- 6.14 The issue of withdrawal of a permit scheme is covered in paragraphs 2.10 to 2.12. It is recognized that an improved system of identifying schemes which are no longer required is needed, potentially based upon information from Parking Services regarding enforcement not being required in these areas. This will be considered in further detail and reported to the next meeting of Scrutiny.

## **7 Best practices from other local authorities,**

- 7.1 The Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE) undertook a survey of member local authorities regarding 'Resident Parking Schemes: Towards Best Practice' in May 2005. The survey findings are included as Appendix 2. The key areas investigated were:
- Streets Suitable for Resident Parking Schemes
  - The Advantages and Disadvantages of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs)
  - How to Prioritise New Parking Schemes
  - Shared User Bays – the challenge of Pay and Display and Voucher Schemes.
  - Non-Residential Access
- 7.2 There is a wide variety of methods used to determine the need for a scheme. Appendix 3 shows the assessment criteria used by a selection of authorities. Within the Authorities listed in Appendix 3, the most common areas of assessment are based upon:-
- i) Properties with no off-street parking facility,
  - ii) The level of support from residents for the scheme,
  - iii) The availability of road space for parking, and
  - iv) Availability of alternative parking.
- 7.3 The assessment method currently used in Leeds consider item i); ii) and iii).

## **8 Summary**

- 8.1 Allowing residents to fund such schemes themselves will work well for injecting additional funding into the programme and allowing more schemes to be progressed. But officers would strongly recommend that it is only used for schemes which fall within the policy. It would be inequitable for it to become a means of promoting inappropriate or low priority schemes in advance of high priority and will not necessarily reduce the time required to implement a scheme.
- 8.2 Off-setting costs with a combination of RPPS and pay and display in some cases will make best use of limited kerb space and officers are already considering this option in appropriate locations.
- 8.3 Combining RPPS with limited waiting has similar benefits and again is being promoted in appropriate circumstances.
- 8.4 Introducing permit charges is possible but needs careful consideration. At first analysis the potential income is high and accounting requirements stipulate that any excess over operating costs be spent on highways. However in reality the income may be much lower due to reduced demand for schemes and permits. This is particularly true if a more equitable arrangement is made for visitor parking.
- 8.5 The fact that income may not match initial analysis is not necessarily an issue if there are other benefits in terms of positively changing car ownership, parking and travel behaviour which will make better use of limited road and parking space. But there could also be negative impacts as parking is transferred to adjacent areas. It could also be costly to administer.
- 8.6 Limiting the number of permits issued could have similar positive and negative impacts to charging for permits but may be a necessary step if charges are introduced in order that spaces are not over subscribed.
- 8.7 It is right that existing schemes should be monitored and reviewed. This has not previously been done, primarily because there has been no demand while permits were free. Also traffic staff resources have been limited and this would be non fee earning work and would therefore need a budget! However, if charges were introduced, such a review would be necessary.
- 8.8 It is also right that there should be maximum clarity and transparency in the policy relating to RPPS. While officers currently follow best practice guidance (as described in the earlier report), there is no

published or approved policy. This is currently being addressed, including future publication of guidance on the web site which help promote understanding and manage expectations of what can be delivered and to what time scales.

## **9 Recommendation**

- 9.1 Members of the City Development Scrutiny Board are asked to note the contents of this report and are invited to comment on the information presented.

### ***Background Documents***

Response from Other Authorities – Appendix 1

APSE Response – Appendix 2

Criteria selection from Other Authorities – Appendix 3

Equality, Diversity and Community Cohesion Impact Assessment dated 29<sup>th</sup> April 2008