

# WARDS AFFECTED

#### FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS:

Cabinet 25<sup>th</sup> March 2002

EXTENSION OF RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES

### Report of the Director of Environment, Development & Commercial Services

## 1. Purpose of Report

To agree the basic principles with regard to the design and implementation of further residents parking schemes for the city and to agree a timetable for such work.

# 2. Summary

- 2.1 The major stumbling blocks which have prevented the introduction of further residents parking schemes in Leicester have been a lack of staff resources within the Council, coupled with a lack of police resources to enforce such restrictions.
- 2.2 In March 2001 the traffic group recruited eight additional members of staff and, more recently, in November 2001 a reorganisation of workload within the group took place. A team leader and three other staff are now working full time on: residents parking; the introduction of decriminalised parking enforcement: and, advisory disabled parking places.
- 2.3 The ultimate solution to the enforcement problem lies in the introduction of decriminalised parking enforcement (DPE) which will result in the City Council taking over the responsibility for the enforcement of all waiting restrictions in the city. That enforcement will be funded from the fines income generated. Unfortunately the work required prior to the introduction of DPE will take an estimated five years to complete.
- 2.4 In June 2001 the City Council contacted the Chief Constable regarding the possibility of the police agreeing to enforce residents parking schemes in key areas, in the period until DPE is introduced, with the possible financial assistance of the Council.
- 2.5 This report informs members of the current situation with regard to these matters.

#### 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That the Cabinet approves the timetable for the introduction of residents parking schemes set out in tabular form in item 1.8 of the supporting information.
- 3.2 That the Cabinet confirm that the scheme must be self financing and therefore, with effect from the date of introduction of the Highfields South area scheme, the cost of residents parking permits be raised to £48 per annum.
- 3.3 That the Cabinet agrees the strategy for designing and implementing residents parking schemes set out in Appendix 1.
- 3.4 That in view of the increase in the cost of permits and the strategies approved for the implementation of residents parking schemes a further round of public consultation be carried out.

## 4. Headline Financial and legal Implications

4.1 A significant annual shortfall in funding of up to £228,000 in the 2004/2005 financial year would result if the residents parking schemes proposed in this report were implemented with the current £22 fee for permits being maintained. Increasing the permit fee to £48 per annum would allow the schemes to be self financing in terms of enforcement and administration costs.

# 5. Report Author/Officer to contact:

5.1 Paul Commons, Team Leader TRO Team, Ext 6678



# WARDS AFFECTED

#### FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS:

Cabinet 25<sup>th</sup> March 2002

EXTENSION OF RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### 1. Report

- 1.1 In September 1998 the Urban Management Sub-Committee approved a report setting out the timetable for the introduction of residents parking schemes in the City. That timetable indicated that residents parking schemes would be implemented in the Highfields South, West End and Riverside areas in 2001, followed by schemes for Belgrave, Aylestone, Highfields North and Clarendon Park in 2002. A lack of resources within the City Council and a lack of police resources to enforce the restrictions has severely hampered progress and that timetable cannot be met.
- 1.2 In March 2001 the traffic group recruited eight additional members of staff and, more recently, in November 2001 a reorganisation of workload within the group took place. A team leader and three other staff are now working full time on residents parking; the introduction of decriminalised parking enforcement: and, advisory disabled parking places. The staff recruited had no previous experience of this type of work but are currently undergoing extensive training and are nearly ready to commence work on introducing residents parking schemes.
- 1.3 The three existing small residents parking schemes in the city suffer from a lack of enforcement. Adequate enforcement of future schemes is absolutely essential to their success. Inadequate enforcement is a national problem; the solution is for local authorities to take over enforcement responsibility from the police and to fund that enforcement from the fine income generated. It is estimated that it will take a minimum of 5 years for the work to be completed across the whole city to allow the introduction of decriminalised parking enforcement (DPE) in Leicester.
- 1.4 The Chief Constable was contacted in June 2001 and asked if there was any way in which the police and City Council could co-operate to allow residents parking schemes to be introduced in the near future. This early implementation of residents parking schemes would require adequate enforcement by the police until such time as the Council gains DPE powers.

- 1.5 Meetings, an exchange of correspondence and numerous phone calls have taken place between Council officers and representatives of the constabulary regarding this matter. There are now clear indications that the constabulary would agree to carry out the enforcement, subject to the Council meeting the cost which is estimated to be £430,000 per annum to enforce the existing schemes adequately together with Highfields South, West End, Riverside and Belgrave which contain an estimated total of 13,500 parking spaces. Estimates of the cost of enforcing Aylestone, Highfields North & Clarendon Park areas have been calculated using the same annual cost per parking space, which is £32 per annum.
- 1.6 A significant amount of work is required to facilitate the introduction of residents parking schemes. Whilst some of the initial survey work is currently being undertaken much of the detailed work can only be carried out once a firm timetable is agreed.
- 1.7 The proposal to introduce enforceable disabled parking bays to replace some existing advisory bays has necessitated delaying the implementation of the first scheme by several months. This delay is due to the need to recruit an additional member of staff to deal with this area of work and to identify which of the existing advisory bays meet the criteria recommended for enforceable bays.
- 1.8 Subject to negotiations with the police regarding the enforcement issues being satisfactorily concluded and the finance being available the table below shows a realistic timetable for the introduction of residents parking schemes. It is likely that the West End and Belgrave areas will each need to be split into several zones, which may require a phased introduction. The timetable takes account of work already carried out in these areas and the complexities caused by the mixture of residential, commercial and business use which varies area by area.

| AREA             | INITIAL      | DETAILED     | IMPLEMENTATION |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
|                  | CONSULTATION | SCHEME       |                |
| Highfields South | 1997         | October 2002 | February 2003  |
| West End         | 1997         | June 2003    | October 2003   |
| Riverside        | 1994         | June 2003    | October 2003   |
| Belgrave         | 1999         | June. 2004   | December 2004  |
| Aylestone        | 2004         | 2005         | 2005           |
| Highfields North | 2004         | 2005         | 2006           |
| Clarendon Park   | 2005         | 2006         | 2006/7         |

#### FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS

# 2. Financial Implications

2.1 The financial implications are difficult to assess accurately. Indications from the police are that enforcement costs, based on enforcing in the region of 13,500 spaces, are £32 per space. Enforcing a smaller number of spaces is significantly more expensive. It is recommended that in principle the scheme must be self financing.

- 2.2 The number of residents parking permits likely to be issued has been assumed to equate to the number of parking spaces available. There is no other data available at the present time to allow a more accurate assessment to be made.
- 2.3 Assuming that the present scratchcard visitor permit scheme is retained it is estimated that the income from such permits will continue to cover the costs of their provision (£1 each). At the present time the administration of the annual permits for the small existing schemes is handled jointly by Customer Services and Traffic Group clerical staff. Additional staff resources will be required to operate the distribution of permits for the more extensive schemes. It will also be necessary to purchase permit production software and to move to a computer based system. It has been assumed that the first additional post will be required from August 2002, with three further additional posts being required as Riverside / West End, Belgrave and Aylestone areas are introduced. At the present time it is estimated that the cost of provision and administration of the permit system accounts for the full £22. With economies of scale it is estimated that those costs will fall to below £20 per permit. The figures reflect the costs of employing the additional staff.
- 2.4 A total contribution by Leicester City Football Club of £255,000 has been negotiated for introducing and enforcing residents parking schemes and DPE in the parts of the City surrounding the new football stadium. Part of that money is set aside for use after the introduction of DPE, £160,000 is available for immediate use and has been taken into account in the calculations to determine the cost of residents parking permits.
- 2.5 Each year since the introduction of on street parking charges, £100,000 from the surplus income has been provided for reviewing traffic orders to enable DPE to be introduced. It has been estimated that £50,000 each year will be used in the process of introducing the residents parking traffic orders leaving £50,000 available for the review of restrictions in other parts of the City.
- 2.6 Having examined all potential sources of funding for the introduction and enforcement of residents parking schemes it has been concluded that an increase in the cost of permits to at least £48 is required to prevent a budget shortfall.
- 2.7 Residents parking schemes are not a panacea to cure all parking ills and many difficult problems need to be faced in implementing such schemes. Appendix 1 outlines these problems and recommends the strategy to be adopted when designing the schemes.
- 2.8 In those areas where residents have previously been consulted on the basis of an annual charge of £22, it would be prudent to consult again on the basis of the proposed higher charge. The proposed charge is less than £1 a week, and such a charge will ensure that the schemes are properly enforced, on the basis of a formal contract with the Police.
- 2.9 The proposed permit charge will cover the costs involved in providing enforceable disabled parking bays to replace the existing advisory parking bays subject to the criteria set out in Appendix 1 item 6.

### 3. Legal Implications

3.1 There are no legal implications arising from the recommendations contained in this report. Residents parking schemes are introduced by traffic regulation orders under the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996. All aspects of that legislation will be complied with.

#### 4. Other Implications

4.1

| OTHER IMPLICATIONS             | YES/NO | Paragraph References With Supporting information |
|--------------------------------|--------|--|
| Equal Opportunities            | Yes    | Appendix 1 item 6                                |
| Policy                         | No     |  |
| Sustainable and Environmental  | No     |  |
| Crime and Disorder             | No     |  |
| Human Rights Act               | No     |  |
| Elderly / People on Low income | No     |  |

# 5. Background Papers

- 5.1 Report approved by Urban Management Sub Committee, September 1998.
- 5.2 Letter from Chief Superintendent Holland dated 28<sup>th</sup> December 2001.

#### 6. Details of Research & Consultation

- 6.1 Meeting attended by Meredith Evans, Mike Pepper & Superintendent Bill Holland on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2001.
- 6.2 Meeting attended by Peter Connolly, Mike Pepper Paul Commons & Superintendent Bill Holland + other police representatives on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2001.

# 7. Report Author

7.1 Paul Commons, Team Leader, TRO Team, Traffic Group, Ext 6678

#### **APPENDIX 1**

# MAJOR STRATEGY ISSUES TO BE DETERMINED PRIOR TO THE INTRODUCTION OF RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES

- 1. In many areas the major parking problem is an overall lack of on street parking places due to the number of residents owning cars exceeding the kerbside space available. The fact that residents parking schemes cannot solve that problem needs to be recognised. Residents parking schemes do not give a resident an exclusive right to the parking space outside their own home. They only give a right to use parking spaces in the zone concerned. These facts need to be recognised and included in the overall policy to be adopted when introducing residents parking schemes. Survey work is currently being carried out to determine the likely number of residents parking permits required in each area. It is recommended that the consultation documentation clearly indicates these limitations.
- 2. Regardless of the current layout of the streets it must be recognised that formal parking places, marked on -street, with permits issued for the use of the space, can only be marked where sufficient width of carriageway exists to allow for that parking and the passage of other traffic. Consultation will be required with interested parties (eg Fire Service) and a policy agreed as to the minimum width of road which will be maintained for passing traffic. This in turn will determine where parking places can be accommodated and may result in a perception by residents that "parking places" are being lost. These facts need to be recognised and included in the overall policy to be adopted when introducing residents parking schemes. It is recommended that within the residents parking zones, on street parking is only permitted where it can be accommodated wholly on the carriageway and without adversely affecting the passage of traffic. It is further recommended that at all other locations within the residents parking zones appropriate waiting prohibitions are applied.
- 3. In some areas the demand for parking permits may exceed the number of spaces available. Any attempt to ration permits is likely to be seen as unfair, It is therefore recommended that permits be made available for any resident in a particular zone who can demonstrate that they are the keeper of a vehicle regardless of the number of parking spaces available in that zone, provided that permits be limited to one per household in those areas such as Bede Island South where the scheme is designed and put in place before the properties are occupied and where parking provision has intentionally been limited to one space per household.
- 4. In many streets there is a mixture of residential and business properties and many businesses do not have off street parking spaces available or have fewer spaces than are required for the operation of the business. A policy for dealing with business parking needs to be determined. The following recommendations are made with regard to business parking
  - a. Business permits be provided at a cost of £100 per annum.
  - b. Business permits allow the holder to park in residents parking bays but only between 7.30am & 6pm.
  - c. The number of permits available to any particular business be limited to the number of off street parking spaces that would be permitted to be provided

if planning consent was given for that business at the time that the scheme is introduced based on the criteria for the central commercial zone (zone 2). The maximum level of parking for each class of business use being specified in the Supplementary Planning Guidance which accompanies the Local Plan. Provided that any existing off street parking provision available to that business is taken into account and deducted from the maximum number of permits that business is allowed to purchase.

- d. Business permits only to be provided in areas of new residents parking schemes where planning consent for that business use is in force at the time that the scheme is introduced and not for subsequent new development or changes of use.
- 5. In most areas the need to accommodate short stay parking in the vicinity of shops etc needs to be considered. It is recommended that in designing the layout of restrictions in the vicinity of shops and businesses that sufficient shared use parking bays be introduced to cater for short stay visitors. That these shared use bays allow unrestricted parking by residents and parking for up to one hour between 7.30am and 6.00pm for non permit holders.
- 6. Many Advisory Disabled Parking Places have been marked in the streets where residents parking schemes are proposed. The use of the marking could render the residents parking bay restriction unenforceable. The guidance notes issued have always made it clear that the markings might have to be removed to allow residents parking schemes to be introduced. As the detailed work in each residents parking area is started it will be necessary to refuse further requests for advisory disabled parking place markings. Alternative formal, legally enforceable, bays could be introduced. These would be very expensive to maintain, both financially and in staff time; with each addition or removal of a bay requiring up to 20 hours of an officer's time and additional expenditure of approximately £1000 on advertising and legal costs. Many of the existing advisory bays have been provided for orange badge holders who are not themselves the driver of the vehicle for which the parking bay is provided and it might be considered that the able bodied driver could be expected to drop off the disabled passenger and park in the nearest available space. Any orange / blue badge holder is entitled to park in a residents parking bay for an unlimited period and orange / blue badge holders who are residents will be provide with a free residents parking permit. It is considered that the proposed charge of £48 for residents parking permits will provide sufficient funds to allow the introduction of enforceable bays including the cost of employing an additional member of staff. It is recommended that the consultation documentation clearly indicates that some advisory parking bays will be removed but that where the orange / blue badge holder is the driver of the vehicle a formal enforceable disabled parking bay will be proposed.

It is further recommended that any person who has paid for an advisory disabled parking bay which is removed and not replaced by an enforceable bay, within one year of a residents parking scheme being introduced is given a full refund of £84.60 and for a bay provided for between one and two years a 50% refund of £42.30.

It is also recommended that the free residents parking permit for orange / blue badge holders be limited to one per household.

- 7. The need to accommodate residents' visitors requires consideration. The scheme in place in the existing Holy Trinity residents parking area seems to work well. Under that scheme scratchcards are used, residents purchase them in advance for use when required. Under the present system
  - a. Cards cost £1 each;
  - b. Maximum of 5 can be purchased at any one time;
  - c. They are activated by writing the vehicle registration number in the space provided and scratching off the time and date of arrival.
  - d. Each ticket lasts for up to 48 hours to allow overnight parking; and
  - e. There is no maximum period of stay specified at the present time.

It is recommended that this system be applied to future residents parking schemes and that the visitor parking permits be restricted to use by residents only and not be extended to include businesses.

- 8. The increase in the cost of residents parking permits necessary to finance the enforcement of the schemes might cause particular difficulties for residents with low incomes. To help alleviate this problem it is recommended that permits valid for 6 months at a cost of £24 be made available on request.
- 9. The efficient issuing and renewal of permits will only be achieved by spreading the dates when permits are renewed evenly throughout the year. In order to achieve this spread of renewal dates it is recommended that officers are authorised to vary the duration of permits provided to between 6 months and 18 months at a charge equivalent to the annual cost of £48 (ie £4 per month) as required.
- 10. It is recommended that all residents within the boundaries of future residents parking areas be eligible to purchase residents parking permits regardless of whether or not they have any off street parking provision.