

# **Review of Residents Parking Schemes**

## **Scrutiny Inquiry Report**

# Introduction and Scope



## Introduction

1. We agreed in considering our work programme to undertake an inquiry to review residents parking schemes in the city.
2. It was a concern to us that it appeared to many Members and residents that the waiting time for the introduction of residents parking schemes was unacceptably long even once they had been approved and added to the Council's waiting list for implementation.
3. We recognised that the main reason for this was that there was only a limited amount of funding available in the Council budget each year for such schemes and that it had been necessary to prioritise requests according to greatest need.
4. However, the demand for such schemes was increasing year on year, particularly in certain areas of the city, and we were of the view that other options needed to be considered if the credibility of the process was to be maintained.
5. To this end we particularly wanted to explore a suggestion that some kind of dual scheme be operated where residents could be offered the opportunity of paying for the introduction of a residents parking scheme themselves. Where a large proportion of residents are commuters some of the cost could be recouped by releasing spaces during the day for 'pay and display' parking by non-residents.
6. We wanted to ensure that the current process of introducing residents parking schemes was fit for purpose and to ensure that whatever conclusions we reached that the process remained transparent and scrupulously fair.
7. We recognised that it was likely that our recommendations would have resource implications for the City Development and Environment & Neighbourhood departments responsible for this service but consider that a review was necessary.
8. We agreed terms of reference for this inquiry at our Board meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2008.
9. We acknowledged the roles and responsibilities which the City Development and Environment and Neighbourhoods Departments have for resident parking schemes and the good work that is undertaken on a daily basis to keep the traffic moving safely in our city.
10. We are very grateful to everyone who gave their time to participate in this inquiry and for their commitment in helping us to understand and review this matter.

## Scope of the inquiry

11. We agreed that the purpose of the Inquiry was to make an assessment of and where appropriate, make recommendations on, the following areas
  - The effectiveness of current arrangements for establishing a residents parking scheme.

# Introduction and Scope



- The practicality of allowing resident parking schemes to be paid for by residents themselves, in particular how enforcement of the scheme would be carried out.
- The viability of any other proposals to speed up the process of establishing resident parking schemes.



Resident Permit Parking, 24 hour waiting restriction and unrestricted parking



# Conclusions and Recommendations



1. We were advised that Councils do not have a duty to provide on-street parking facilities.
2. The issue of car parking, particularly nuisance parking, is at the forefront of Regeneration and Liveability issues. That said we acknowledge that the primary function of the highway is for the movement of traffic. Contrary to popular belief, a resident does not have any special claim to a parking space in front of their own property and there was no way that this could practically be designated. It was reasonable, however, for residents to be able to park within close proximity to their property as this increases accessibility and security. Parking could be allowed where this does not impinge on the movement of traffic or where it does not create a safety hazard, or obstruct access to property or for emergency vehicles, or cause damage to the fabric of the highway (footway).
3. We were advised that the cost of introducing a Residents Parking Scheme (RPS) including investigation, consultation, reporting, advertising, signing and road markings, legal fees and permit issuing was estimated as £230 per space from recent schemes. There was, also, on-going maintenance of the signs and road markings to ensure enforcement can continue.
4. In addition, there would be costs incurred in enforcement of any RPS for Parking Services.
5. We acknowledge that the waiting time for RPSs has improved considerably in the last few years. However, the current list of outstanding schemes is substantial and anything that can be done to improve waiting times still further should be explored.

6. Resident Parking Schemes recently introduced, programmed for introduction and being investigated are as follows:

WARD	LOCATION	PROGRAMMED
Bramley & Stanningley	Broad Lane/Broadlea Terrace	Complete 2006/07
Pudsey	Woodlands, Devonshire Gardens	Complete 2006/07
Headingley	Chapel Street	Complete 2007/08
Hyde Park & Woodhouse	Oatlands/Carltons, Little London	Complete 2007/08
Headingley	The Granby's, Headingley	Complete 2007/08
City & Hunslet	Admiral Street	Complete 2007/08
Pudsey	Mulberry St	Complete 2007/08
Headingley	The Granby's, Headingley	Complete 2007/08
Beeston & Holbeck	Thirlmere Gardens	Alternative restriction introduced.
Garforth & Swillington	Coupland Road, Garforth	2008/09
Temple Newsam	Knightsway	2008/09
Weetwood	Glen Road Area	2008/09
Horsforth	Kerry Hill	2008/09
Pudsey	Mulberry Street	2008/09
Horsforth	Scotland Lane	2008/09
Armley	Modder Avenue	2008/09
Pudsey	Pudsey Town Centre	2008/09
Headingley	Ancaster Rd/Otley Rd	2008/09
Yeadon	Airport	2008/09
Hyde Park & Woodhouse	Elthams/Holborn Estate/ Shay Street:-	2008/09/10
Hyde Park & Woodhouse	Woodhouse Street/Cliff Road area	2008/09/10
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	St James Hospital	2008/09/10
Hyde Park & Woodhouse	Woodsley Road Area, Burley	Earliest 2009/10
Hyde Park & Woodhouse	Brudenell Area, Hyde Park	Earliest 2009/10
Beeston & Holbeck	Millshaw Road	2009/10
Rothwell	Woodlesford Station	Under investigation
Beeston & Holbeck	Sunny Views/Wesley Street	Existing RPS programmed for review.
Kirkstall	Waterside	Not programmed
Beeston & Holbeck	Malvern Street	Not programmed

## Conclusions and Recommendations



7. We acknowledged that the RPS process is transparent and thorough but takes a significant length of time from injection into the Traffic Engineering work programme to actual delivery on site.
8. Our initial thoughts were that by giving residents the option of paying for an RPS themselves, this external funding would provide a fast track approach to the problem. However, on closer examination we recognise the limitations of this option.
9. We acknowledge that an RPS might not be the solution to parking problems and one size does not fit all. Should residents be permitted to fund an RPS they may consider that a scheme should be provided irrespective of any agreed criteria for providing an RPS in other areas or advice provided by officers. If the scheme was provided which did not meet the expectations of the community, consideration would have to be given to resolving the situation, but at a cost to whom and with what priority?
10. For this to work the Council must have a strong and clear policy on where any RPS will be provided. To avoid the installation of inappropriate schemes only schemes which fall within the policy should be progressed. We totally accept that it would be inadvisable to give residents a remit to have what they want because they are paying, when they do not necessarily have the right information to make a properly informed decision. We considered the alternatives to an RPS

◇ **Long Term Commuters** – The conflict between resident parking demands and those of “car borne commuters” is very real. In this situation councils are

increasingly trying to develop policies that help residents who are, after all, council tax payers. Not all streets are affected by this. Those affected by commuter parking are those close to the city centre, near hospitals, universities, colleges and shopping/business areas.

◇ **Informal Park and Ride/Walk** - Increasingly there are requests for park and ride facilities from residents close to major commuter routes into the city and outlying railway stations as motorists would park in residential areas and then walk, cycle or use public transport for the latter part of their journey. While these actions are supporting the encouragement of alternative forms of transport, at least for a part of a journey, such an informal ‘park and ride/walk’ situation is having an the adverse impact within residential areas. Giving total priority to residents would effectively deter commuters from using public transport and potentially cause congestion elsewhere in the City. Without the proper provision of Park and Ride conflict between residents and commuters will continue.

◇ **Short Term Parking**  
Visitors to local shops, businesses, educational establishments, entertainment/leisure facilities, health centres and residential properties requiring to park for periods between 20 minutes and 3 or 4 hours. These facilities generate short term visits producing a turnover of parking spaces.

# Conclusions and Recommendations



## ◇ Residents

A further conflict lies in the fact that there can be “an excess of demand over supply for the use of on-road spaces from residents alone.” In a nutshell, when there are not even enough spaces for residents, especially as an increasing number of households have multiple vehicle owners, tough choices have to be made.

11. We understand that paying for a scheme would not necessarily accelerate its delivery. In treating our customers fairly, it would be 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 an RPS may discriminate against members of society unable to afford such a scheme but who may be in greater need.
12. We accept that the RPS option is a lengthy process, particularly with the uncertainty around consultation and overcoming objections, and that this will not be shortened simply because the funding is coming from a different source.
13. We do feel however, that because resources are limited, additional sources of funding would allow, in appropriate circumstances, for more schemes to be injected into the programme.
14. We acknowledged the concerns expressed particularly by the traffic section that there is a finite staff resource to deliver a specific programme of work for the year and in considering schemes for subsequent years. Introducing additional schemes into an agreed programme would require either existing programmed schemes to be given a lower priority or additional staff being recruited. We would suggest that a better approach might be to consider the Council's consultant partner, Mouchels, being used to provide that additional staff resource provided these costs are recharged to the residents as part of the costs of the scheme.
15. We were advised that any schemes promoted in this way would be subject to the same legal / enforcement arrangements. This would 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.
16. We consider that it may be possible for revenue to be raised by residents to offset the costs of them paying for an RSP. 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. This should be explored.
17. One alternative approach to residents paying for the implementation of a scheme could be to recover the costs once the scheme is established and residents are gaining its benefits.
18. Another option would be 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



## Conclusions and Recommendations



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.

19. 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 to the facility they want to access e.g. shopping centre.
- ◇ charges levied by any off-street parking in the area
- ◇ type of parking, long or short stay, which the Council may want to encourage.

We appreciate therefore that it is difficult to estimate the potential income generation until such schemes are in operation.

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. In conclusion we recognise the complexity of this issue but take the view that the approach of allowing residents to pay for an RPS or recovering the costs once the scheme has been established to be worthy of consideration provided

- ◇ it does not accelerate lower priority schemes in advance of an area where residents are experiencing severe parking issues because of their ability to pay.
- ◇ the Council retains a strong and clear policy and criteria as to where an RPS is deemed appropriate and that only proposals that meet this criteria would be considered.

# Conclusions and Recommendations



## Recommendation 1:

### **That the Directors of City Development and Environment and Neighbourhoods**

**(i) undertake a review of residents parking schemes including detailed cost benefit analysis and consultation with residents, with a view to introducing an option that would enable residents to fund the cost of a resident parking scheme in accordance with agreed policy and does not accelerate lower priority schemes in advance of schemes on the approved list.**

**(ii) that this analysis work includes the use of the Council's consultants to provide additional staffing resources and methods by which residents could recoup the costs of a residents parking scheme, especially where a large proportion of residents are commuters, by releasing spaces during the day for 'pay and display' parking by non-residents.**

**(iii) that subject to (i) and (ii) above the option to allow residents to pay for a residents parking scheme be introduced from April 2010.**

23. We were informed that there are a wide variety of methods used by local authorities to determine the need for a residents parking scheme but 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.

24. We understand that the assessment method currently used in Leeds considers item i); ii) and iii) above. We feel that the availability of alternative parking should also be taken in to account.

## Recommendation 2:

**That the assessment method for determining the suitability of establishing a residents parking scheme should include the availability of alternative parking and that this be considered as part of the review proposed in recommendation 1.**

25. We wanted to explore other issues related to resident parking schemes and in particular the fact that we do not charge for residents or visitors parking permits and that they are issued for a period of three years.

26. In order to park within a scheme a permit must be displayed, or some other form of dispensation obtained. There are currently 65 schemes with 2 pending. Currently in the region of 22,000 permits are in use. Every zone contains a property list of addresses which can apply for a permit - if you are not on the list you



## Conclusions and Recommendations



cannot apply. There are approximately 11,300 properties listed.

27. We learned that there are 3 types of permit available:-

### ◇ Resident permit

Resident permits are free at issue, although there was a charge of £10 to replace lost permits. Every car parked in a scheme must display a permit to park. A permit can be issued for every car that is registered to the address (so 4 cars = 4 permits). There was no limit on the numbers, but the applicant must supply proof of address and proof that the car was registered there.

The permit has the vehicle registration number written on it and could only be used with the nominated vehicle. The permit normally stated which RPS it applied to. Permits are free and last for 3 years, although this was shortened to the length of the tenancy if the applicant was a tenant. Only residents could apply for a resident permit – not landlords, agents or owners.

### ◇ Visitor permit

Only one visitors permit is issued to every address. They will be issued, upon application, to every address. As they are not specific to a vehicle, they can be used by any vehicle. Applicants must supply proof of address.

Permits are free and last for 3 years, although this was shortened to the length of the tenancy if the applicant was a tenant. Only residents could apply for a

visitor permit – not landlords, agents or owners.

Whilst it was not possible to electronically report on the split between visitor/resident permits in existence, in 2007/8, applications received suggest that 3,807 resident permits were issued compared to 4,262 visitor permits. If this were to be extrapolated across the 22,000 permits, this would give 11,220 visitor permits in use and 9,900 resident permits in use. (The balance figure falls to business permits). This was not surprising as most properties would need a visitor permit, but not all would have a car.

### ◇ Business permit

If one of the addresses on the property list referred to above was a business, they could apply for up to 3 permits. These permits are issued annually and there is a charge of £50 per year per permit to cover the administration but the permits can be used in any vehicle.

In the region of 880 business permits are in place. If they are lost, a £10 administration charge is applicable. The lost permit details are handed onto the parking attendants who look for any fraudulent use.

28. Currently, no charge is made to residents for permits unless they are lost and need replacing. We consider this to be worth exploring further as to whether a charge should be made as a means of recovering

# Conclusions and Recommendations



implementation and on-going operational costs.

29. We note that the issue of whether or not to charge for parking permits is widely debated and we looked at the varying methods used by other local authorities. Income estimates we were told had been based on the existing 9,900 resident permits issued. However, some residents may rarely use their visitor permit and a significant proportion may select not to pay or may reduce their permit requirement for other reasons.

30. Clearly there could be a number of permutations that could be applied if the principle of charging for permits was accepted.

## At Cost

31. It had been shown to us that the administrative costs for residents parking schemes 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

## Charge relative to CO2 emissions or engine size

32. We note that 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.

33. The following table shows, the percentage of vehicles licensed in 2007 with engines of certain sizes from the 'Vehicle Licensing Statistics 2007' and the current number of resident permits issued. We were advised that charges have been selected at random for exemplification.

## Vehicle Licensing Statistics 2007

Engine cc	% of Vehicles	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
<b>Total</b>		<b>9,900</b>	

# Conclusions and Recommendations



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

## Equal Charge per Vehicle

35. 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.

## Escalating charge per Vehicles

36. 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 2nd, 3rd and 4<sup>th</sup> +vehicles.

37. We were advised that the traffic order would describe whether permits are issued per household or per address and this could have major implications for houses in multiple occupancy. A property divided into, say, 6 flats could require 6 permits for residents. The first applicant would receive a free permit; the 2nd 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 Vehicles.	Estimated No. of Permits	Cost of Permits
1.	7,575	£0 - £30
2.	1,980	£50 - £100
3+	345	£150 - £200
Total	9,900	

## Charge related to Zone

38. We understand that some authorities zone their RPS'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.

39. Off-setting costs with a combination of RPS and pay and display in some cases would make best use of limited kerb space and we understand that officers are already considering this option in appropriate locations.

40. Combining RPS with limited waiting has similar benefits and we understand that this is again being promoted in appropriate circumstances.

41. Introducing permit charges we feel 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.

## Conclusions and Recommendations



42. This would be particularly true if a more equitable arrangement was made for visitor parking. We would also take the view that whilst income may not match initial analysis, there would be other benefits in terms of positively changing car ownership, parking and travel behaviour which would make better use of limited road and parking space. However, there could also be negative impacts as parking is transferred to adjacent areas. It could also be costly to administer.
43. We are of the view that there should be a charge for resident parking and visitor parking permits.
44. We recommend that resident parking and visitor parking permits be issued for 12 months and not every three years and that the additional administration costs be recouped from the fee charged but recognise that this cannot be done in isolation.
45. We do not have a strong view as to what the fee should be or method by which charging for resident and visitors parking permits should be applied except to say that the Council should be adequately compensated for the work that it undertakes in this regard.
46. The number of resident parking permits available to each household is currently unlimited which we think is unsustainable and could lead to the number of parking permits being greater than the number of spaces available and so residents would still not be able to park near their homes. However, if the number of parking spaces was limited then properties with a large number of vehicles may not be able to have a permit for every car at that property. Businesses are affected as staff that only require their vehicle to commute to work are not allowed a permit and therefore cannot park, either free of charge or at all, near their place of work. Workmen are inconvenienced when parking in the area as they need to display a visitor permit or could be fined; householders also may not have applied for a visitor permit. Only one visitor permit is allocated per property which would affect properties employing more than one set of workmen. Statutory undertakers also have difficulty parking their vehicles in residents parking zones as they do not have parking permits. However, statutory undertakers and workpeople can apply for a dispensation which would allow them to carry out specific work in an area. These can be granted immediately for emergency work. In addition health and social workers can be issued with permits which allow them to park in resident zones while carrying out their work duties.
47. We are of the view that if charging for parking and visitor permits were introduced it would be necessary to limit the number of resident permits and visitors permits in order that spaces are not over subscribed. We recognise the potential difficulties this would cause but feel that it would contribute positively to changing car ownership, parking and travel behaviour which would make better use of limited road and parking space.

## Conclusions and Recommendations



48. In our discussions we noted that it was 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”*

49. 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.

### **Recommendation 3:**

**That the Directors of City Development and Environment and Neighbourhoods review the issuing of resident and visitors parking permits and consult with residents across the city with a view to**

- (i) phasing in charges for resident and visitor parking permits over a period of 5 years with regular progress reports to the appropriate Scrutiny Board.**
- (ii) residents parking and visitors permits being valid for a period of 1 year instead of 3 years.**
- (iii) restricting the number of resident parking permits (and visitor permits) that are issued to each household.**

50. We consider it essential that existing schemes should be monitored and reviewed. We understand that this has not 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 are introduced, such a review would be necessary.

### **Recommendation 4:**

**That the Directors of City Development and Environment and Neighbourhoods**

- (i) consider introducing regular reviews of resident parking schemes in order to ascertain how well they are operating and if they remain appropriate and fit for purpose, particularly if charging for residents and visitors permits is introduced**
- (ii) report back to this Scrutiny Board on how this might be achieved.**

51. We want the current process and the review to be carried out by the Directors of City Development and Environment & Neighbourhoods to have the maximum clarity and transparency in the policy relating to RPS. However, whilst officers currently follow best practice guidance, there is no published or approved policy by the Council.

52. We acknowledge that information is on the Council's internet site concerning the issuing of residents



# Conclusions and Recommendations



parking permits dispensations and the like. However, there is little or no guidance that promotes understanding of the process involved for residents parking schemes, as described in the reports presented to us, or manages expectations of what can be realistically delivered with regard to RPSs.

## Recommendation 5

**In order to improve the clarity and transparency of the process**

- (i) **That detailed guidance on resident parking schemes that promotes understanding of the process involved with resident parking schemes be included on the Council's web site by early 2009.**
- (ii) **That a policy document on this issue be developed and submitted to this Scrutiny Board for consideration with a view to it being included on the Council's web site.**

53. During our inquiry, concern was raised about the possibility of permit fraud and we questioned what the Council was doing to address this.

54. We noted that whilst it was unusual for a false application for a resident permit to be processed given that this would involve forging documents or falsely registering a vehicle to an address on the property list, visitor permits are completely transferable and therefore easier for a resident to apply for a permit and then sell it on. The sale of visitor permits is common in some areas. This is not common across all

zones, but is concentrated in areas with the following characteristics :

- ◇ Low rate of car ownership (residents who do not wish to have visitors to their property)
- ◇ Adjacent to areas of high commuter demand
- ◇ Alternative parking is chargeable

55. We were advised that Parking Attendants report suspicious parking patterns (for example, if visitors arrive between 8–9 am every weekday) and carry out casual observations to see if further investigation is required (for example, the direction in which the driver walks when leaving the vehicle). This is then referred for further action, which can happen in a number of ways, including issuing parking tickets, cancelling permits, and joint operations with the police, which would involve arrests.

56. Local intelligence we were told can also be obtained from genuine residents who recognise fraudulent use of permits in their area. Such information can be followed up without the need for residents to identify themselves. This usually involves a visitor permit being used by a 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.



## Conclusions and Recommendations



57. We acknowledged that this problem was being tackled in a number of ways. An information sheet was 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“*

58. 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

59. In these cases we were informed an attendant is sent out to check and that 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.

60. We were very surprised to hear that only 4 or 5 permits are cancelled each year.

61. We were also informed of additional one-off operations carried out by the Council with other agencies including the Police and area management such as Operation Champion and others. 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.

62. We learned that Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorate are piloting the use of a dedicated team from September 2008 to look at the level of fraud in residents zones including the misuse of blue badges. This involves using officers in plain clothes to observe parking areas. We understand this will be extended if there are sufficient numbers of offences.

### **Recommendation 6**

**That the results of the pilot scheme to look at the level of fraud in residents parking zones be reported to this Scrutiny Board early in 2009.**

63. We noted that until this year the Traffic Engineering Section has not had the certainty of funding for its Capital Programme over successive years and, therefore, long term planning was difficult. Only schemes which could be taken through from investigation to completion in one year were certain to progress.

## Conclusions and Recommendations



Experience has shown that RPS can take longer than a year. With a slightly more secure financial budget from this year it was possible to plan further ahead and commence schemes which may run over two or more financial years.

### **Recommendation 7:**

**That certainty of funding of residents parking schemes is essential for long term planning of schemes on the approved list and which enables schemes to be run over two or more financial years and that a minimum of a three year planned programme should be adopted for these schemes.**

## Conclusions and Recommendations



### Monitoring arrangements

- Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.
- The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.
- Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

## Reports and Publications Submitted

- Minutes of Scrutiny Board meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2008
- Terms of Reference for the Board's Inquiry dated 15<sup>th</sup> July 2008
- Report of the Director of City Development providing an overview of the process for the introduction of Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) dated 9<sup>th</sup> September 2008
- Report of the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods overview of the administrative and enforcement processes involved with RPS dated 9<sup>th</sup> September 2008
- Minutes of Scrutiny Board (City Development) 9<sup>th</sup> September 2008
- Joint report of the Director of City Development and Environment & Neighbourhoods providing additional information dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2008
- Minutes of Scrutiny Board meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2008
- Written evidence from Councillor James Monaghan, Headingley Ward
- Written evidence from Councillor Penny Ewens, Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward
- Written evidence from Councillor Colin Campbell, Otley & Yeadon Ward

# Evidence



## Witnesses Heard

- Jean Dent, Director of City Development
- Helen Franklin, Acting Head of Highways Services, City Development
- Howard Claxton, Traffic Engineering Manager, City Development
- Councillor Steve Smith, Executive Board Member with portfolio responsibility for Environmental Services
- Andrew Mason, Chief Environmental Services Officer, Environment & Neighbourhoods
- Graham Wilson, Head of Enforcement, Environment & Neighbourhoods
- Mark Jefford, Parking Manager, Enforcement, Environment & Neighbourhoods
- Councillor Ryk Downes, Ward Councillor for Otley and Yeadon

## Dates of Scrutiny

- |                                  |                        |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| • 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2008     | Scrutiny Board Meeting |
| • 9 <sup>th</sup> September 2008 | Scrutiny Board Meeting |
| • 14 <sup>th</sup> October 2008  | Scrutiny Board Meeting |
| • 16 <sup>th</sup> December 2008 | Scrutiny Board Meeting |