



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, TRANSPORT AND CLIMATE EMERGENCY  
SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: WEDNESDAY, 23 APRIL 2025 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T:

Councillor Waddington - Chair  
Councillor Dr Barton – Vice Chair

Councillor Bajaj

Councillor Batool

Councillor Porter

Councillor Rae Bhatia

Councillor Singh Sangha

In Attendance:

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin  
Assistant City Mayor Councillor Whittle

\* \* \* \* \*

**137. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Councillor Rae Bhatia. Councillor Modhwadia substituted.

**138. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were asked to declare any interests they may have had in the business to be discussed.

There were no declarations of interest.

**139. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

With regard to the item on Electric Vehicle Charging Points Task Group - Executive Response, it was noted that there had not been time at the meeting to discuss the item in depth. As such, points were raised about the practicalities of having charging points in Council-facing buildings. In response to this, it was noted that whilst there would be challenges in installation, if there

was a realistic opportunity for installation, then this should be done.

A further policy document on the issue could be shared with the Commission.

It was noted that Councillor Batool had been marked as both present and having given apologies. It was noted that she was present at the meeting.

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Economic Development, Transport and Climate Emergency Scrutiny Commission held on 12 March 2025 be confirmed as a correct record subject to the above correction.

#### **140. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair informed those present that members of Culture and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission had been invited to the meeting to discuss the item on Worker Exploitation as they had been invited to the task group.

#### **141. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE**

The Monitoring Officer reported that none had been received.

#### **142. PETITIONS**

The Monitoring Officer reported that none had been received.

#### **143. WORKER EXPLOITATION TASK GROUP - REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Chair submitted a report examining worker exploitation in Leicester. The Commission was asked to note the report and support the recommendations set out in section 1.3 of the report.

Professor Nik Hammer of the University of Leicester, who had provided key research and analysis on the task group, summarised the report and recommendations. And presented slides (attached). Additional key points included:

- Two appendices included in the agenda pack were redacted, due to potential political sensitives and ongoing criminal investigations.
- Exploitation was experienced on a nationwide scale, on a spectrum and in a range of jobs.
- There was a national debate surrounding the enforcement gap.
- Violation tracking was problematic, due to the complex reasons as to why those affected would not necessarily report issues. Robust intelligence work was vital in avoiding further marginalisation of vulnerable groups.

- Significant recruitment problems presented within the Social Care sector relating to language barriers and the difficulty this presented in training and upskilling. Partnerships with social care providers could be useful, similar to the Salford and UNISON North-West migrant social care worker charter.
- The Gig Economy shaped conditions for workers such as taxi drivers and food delivery drivers. Companies were often based outside of the locality, so partnerships between Local Authorities and other national agencies would be vital to maintain standards.
- There were some areas where local authorities had an influence on procurement and licencing. Problems arose though due to a lack of capacity for due diligence, for both the contractor and the commissioner.
- Social issues interlinked with matters of worker exploitation. For example, housing issues arose due to low-paid workers being unable to afford high rents. Home Office investigations into migrant working in Bristol had noted caravan dwelling and poor living conditions.
- Fair Work Wales and Fair Work Scotland had developed frameworks using procurement to strengthen labour standards.

In response to questions from the committee, it was noted that:

- Labour standards enforcement and immigration enforcement needed to be dealt with as separate matters as accessing and supporting vulnerable workers would become even more difficult if they suspected full immigration scrutiny.
- Vital trust building with marginalised groups could be established via trade unions and community groups. Learning could be taken from the FAB-L approach, which was specific to the garment industry, but could be applied more widely.
- Conflicts of interest arose with enforcement action, which could lead to difficulties in gathering information.

AGREED:

- 1) That the report be noted.
- 2) That the report be presented to the Executive and the response from the Executive be brought back to the Commission.
- 3) That the report be shared with local MPs, including The Secretary of State for Work and Pensions.

#### **144. CALL-IN - PARKING FEES AND CHARGES**

The Monitoring Officer submitted a report informing the Commission that the Executive decision taken by the City Mayor on 25 March 2025 relating to increasing parking charges had been the subject of a 6-member call-in under the procedures at Rule 12 of Part 4D, City Mayor and Executive Procedure

Rules, of the Council's Constitution.

The Chair clearly outlined the process that she would follow in determining how to resolve the call-in. The Commission was recommended to either:

- a) Note the report without further comment or recommendation. (If the report was noted the process continues and the call-in will be considered at Council on Full Council or
- b) Comment on the specific issues raised by the call-in. (If comments were made the process continues and the comments and call-in would be considered at Full Council); or
- c) Resolve that the call-in be withdrawn (If the committee wished for there to be no further action on the call-in, then they must actively withdraw it. If withdrawal was agreed the call-in process stops, the call-in would not be considered at Full Council and the original decision takes immediate effect without amendment).

The Chair invited the proposer of the call-in, Councillor Porter, to make their case. The following points were raised:

- Council proposals had been made to increase charges to on-street and off-street parking.
- It was suggested that those on a low-income and already struggling with increased cost of living prices would be most affected.
- It was put forward that increased parking charges could have a negative effect on the city centre economy. Competitor retail sites, such as Fosse Park, located beyond the city boundary, had free parking.
- A counter suggestion was put forward to reduce city centre parking fees to improve retail revenue.
- The most recently published Revenue Budget reflected a current deficit of £400k in parking income for the city.
- Proposals had been made to remove night-owl charges, this was the reduced rate parking fee designed to boost the city's night-time economy. Out of hours bus services could be problematic so city centre night-time could be impacted by a reduction in footfall.

The Chair invited the seconder of the call-in, to the table to make their case. Councillor Modhwadia attended the meeting as substitute for seconder Councillor Kitterick and raised the following point:

- Reductions to parking charges could bring people into the city which would support local business and create revenue for the council.

The Chair invited Assistant City Mayor for Environment and Transport, Councillor Whittle, to respond. A presentation was given (slides attached) and the following points were raised:

- Overall, city centre tariffs would increase by 25% for on street pay and

display and off-street parking.

- There would a higher increase for Victoria Park.
- The evening discount would be terminated.
- The tariff for parks would increase by 10%.
- Blue Badge free parking would remain in place.
- Sunday street parking would be chargeable.
- New fees would commence on the 12<sup>th</sup> May.
- There would be an annual review charges to consider inflation.
- Inflationary cost charges in CCTV monitoring, energy cost, maintenance and third-party services all led to the need for an increase in charges.
- There had also been major capital investment in recent years to improve service and ensure safer parking.
- Changes would create an annual saving of £1.1m, £0.5m would cover service cost pressures.
- Savings would contribute to the 3-year savings target for Planning, Development and Transportation.
- Private operators would also be increasing their charges.
- In terms of benchmarking, Leicester's council parking site tariffs would remain up to 60% lower than private sites in Leicester and Derby.
- Leicester short stay parking charges were among the cheapest in the midlands.
- The evening tariffs were lower than Nottingham and Derby.
- Sunday charges were in line with neighbouring cities.
- There was an emphasis on low-cost travel within the city including the fare cap of £3 on bus fares, concessionary bus tickets, Park and Ride and the Free Hop service.
- Previously raised parking fees had not led to reduced occupancy levels.
- Privately owned car parks did not offer the same level of provision as Leicester City Council car parks and charged more.
- High quality cycling and walking routes into the city were available.
- Evening free carparking would remain in place.
- The City Centre offer was wider than retail, including leisure and tourism amongst the portfolio.
- It was recommended that the scrutiny commission resolved that the call-in was withdrawn.

Members of the Commission discussed the report which highlighted the following points:

- Increased parking charges was estimated to generate £1m revenue in the first year.
- Consultation was not required when amending parking tariffs. A newspaper notice and notices within the car parks were required.
- Parking in Leicester city was comparatively cheaper than other cities and it would be good for this to be publicised.

The Chair asked if the proposer wished to withdraw the call-in. It was noted that the proposer wished for the call-in to proceed.

Councillor Bajaj moved that, following the points raised during the meeting, the call-in be withdrawn. This was seconded by Cllr Barton and upon being put to the vote the motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

That the call-in be withdrawn.

AGREED:

- For a report to be brought to Commission, to include car park usage since the increased charges.
- More publication to be given regarding the relative low cost of using Council car parks.

*Councillor Porter and Councillor Modhwadia left the meeting at the end of this item.*

## **145. INWARD INVESTMENT AND PLACE MARKETING**

The Director of Tourism, Culture, and Inward Investment submitted a report updating the Commission on the work of the Place Marketing Team for Leicester and Leicestershire.

The Director of Inward Investment and Place Marketing provided an overview of the report, key points to note were:

- The Place Marketing Team was a partnership between Leicester City and Leicestershire County councils.
- There was around £47k core council budget supporting the service, with the remainder coming from other funding.
- The most recent data on Tourism came from 2023. City tourism had brought in around £844m annually.
- Visitor numbers had increased by 2.4% on the previous year.
- Local Visitor Economy Partnership (LVEP Accreditation) had been secured which could position the city well in terms of future funding.
- Work was ongoing to create a new Destination Management website with increased functionality.
- There was a significant move towards improving commercial opportunities within the city. Around £48k had been generated in

the previous year.

- Group travel was a key target market. The Annual Conference for the Association of Group Travel Organisers had been secured and Leicester City would be in the spotlight as a destination for group travel. Leicester had been nominated for a third year in a row as being a best destination for group travel.
- Work was underway for a new destination management plan which would run between 2026-2031. This was a county wide strategy, the Leicester City plan was being updated at the same time to ensure alignment between the two.
- Regarding inward investment achievements, £11.2m of investment value had been secured, creating 183 new jobs with 205 jobs safeguarded in the city.
- Leads generated equated to £7.3m, with 35 new jobs.
- There was a focus on the new council work spaces, such as Canopy, Dock and the Blackbird Industrial Estate.
- A lot of activity included investor events. £43k of private sector funding had been secured.

Members were invited to comment and ask questions, responses were as follows:

- In terms of long-term resilience, business partnerships were common with project delivery. Campaigns to attract tourists were in place with the aim to join companies and venues together, offering a full tourist package.
- The new Visit Leicester website helped to build support for communities and accessibility. Tracking capabilities helped to access long-term impact.
- Case studies formed much of the development work surrounding sustainable tourism. Best practice examples were shared to break down barriers for customers.
- Software was employed to track key words in online feedback. Significant work went into providing positive responses.
- Successful efforts had attracted a diverse range of businesses. Connectivity with the private sector had been a key focus.
- The Destination Plan and Visit Britain attracted wider business and there were further opportunities to develop overseas interest.
- Promotion was ongoing, with a range different agents and landlords, to increase business opportunities in empty units.

AGREED:

- 1) That the report be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken

into account by the lead officers.

*Councillor Cutkelvin left the meeting following the consideration of this item.*

#### **146. 24-HOUR BUS LANES - EXECUTIVE RESPONSE.**

An update was submitted on the executive response on the Scrutiny Task Group on Bus Lanes. This was taken as read.

The Commission agreed that they were satisfied with the response.

AGREED:

That the response be noted.

#### **147. 20MPH PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The City Transport Director submitted a report to provide members of the commission with an update on the progress of the City's 20mph programme, and to provide members of the commission with details on the next phases of the City's 20mph programme.

Key points to note other than those on the slides (attached with the agenda pack) were:

- Any opportunities to consider roads for 20mph would now be considered.
- A monitoring approach was being taken to assess the level of impact. This took into account best practice from the government.
- The level of impact and level of support would be considered in order to refine the programme further.
- Air quality was a national issue, and this would be monitored.
- An updated version of programme progress would be produced.
- Three further 20mph zones had come online since the slides had been published.
- The roads marked in purple had joint Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) with Leicestershire County Council.
- Traffic surveys had been scheduled for this side of the school summer holidays.
- People could search for individual roads to ascertain their status.

Members were invited to comment and ask questions, Responses were as follows:



- In response to queries about how marginalised areas were approached to ensure that the consultation was representative, it was explained that the biggest issue with engagement was that it was a niche issue. In order to boost engagement, door-knocking had been undertaken. It was also the case that in certain communities, people had stepped forward as a spokesperson for a community to suggest that there was a demand for 20mph zones in the area. Ward Councillors had also done this on behalf of residents. It was noted that a comparative number of objections had not been received and the City Transport Director could not recall a time when a 20mph zone had been brought in and residents has said that they were not consulted correctly.
- Additionally, whilst the sector had struggled with engagement, it was considered as to how it could be ensured that people had a voice, particularly in lower performing areas.
- It was noted that when surveys were assessed over multiple years there could be negative perceptions where the reality was different. This was due to people perceiving lower speeds as speeding, when average speeds were reduced, people were in the mindset of lower speeds.
- Traffic calming measures were monitored to ensure they were appropriate, and maintenance and safety features were looked at to ascertain if lessons could be learned.
- Support was there as long as the Council engaged from the beginning and were open and honest about intentions.
- In response to queries about supporting data for road safety, it was noted that there had been a trend of a reduction in casualties with regard to other road users (i.e. pedestrians or cyclists). Compliance with the 20mph scheme had been high and average speeds were reducing. There had been a general reduction of traffic on calmed roads. Additionally, more people were now walking and cycling and doing so over increased distances. There were comparative measures showing a positive impact on measures that were aimed for and a negative impact on measures that were hoped to be avoided. Data was available from spot-checks and city-wide measure.

#### AGREED:

- 1) That the report be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account by the lead officers.

### **148. LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN**

The City Transport Director submitted a report to provide members of the commission with details on the proposed Local Cycling and Walking

Infrastructure Plan and to make members of the commission aware of the forthcoming consultation, and provide details for how they may contribute to the plan.

The report and presentation (included with the agenda pack) were taken as read.

Additional points made included:

- The plan was part of a consultation approach. Members would be invited to an informal review.
- A strategic plan was being developed. This was not prescriptive and was aimed at identifying key corridors where the quality of cycling and walking could be increased.
- A consultation would take place with Ward Councillors, residents and stakeholders.
- It was added that the information in the previous report on 20mph zones demonstrated that conditions were being created to make it safer to walk and cycle.

Members were invited to comment and ask questions, Responses were as follows:

- In response to a query about how the plan fitted in with climate goals and equity priorities, it was explained that there were increasing options for walking and cycling to increase access to employment, education and leisure, which ultimately would lead to more in terms of employment and improvements in social mobility and an overall uplift in the economy of the city both in terms of decarbonisation and having wealthier and more educated users.
- In response to a question about key challenges in funding and infrastructure, funding was the biggest challenge as demand for installation was bigger than the money received from the government. The projects in the plan were large by their very nature, for example, some included big junctions. The current funding model was annual and done on a bidding approach. In order to make a bid, a design needed to be ready and a bid might not be successful. This meant that there was a need to deliver at pace, meaning that schemes developed were at risk and needed to fit the definitions of the funding bid. The manufactured timescales could be difficult.
- In terms of providing incentives to reach out to audiences, particularly children and young people, it was clarified that there was a cycle accessibility programme with schools. A schools ride had been planned in conjunction with Leicester Cathedral, however, it had been difficult to establish dates for this which were convenient for the cathedral, but this was being looked at for next year. There was government funding

available for this kind of activity and it was sought to maximise the impact of this and consider how to have a broad approach but also have direct support where needed. Branded helmets had been considered and it was looked to launch more programmes such as clean air days. It was aimed to reach out to younger people, and as part of this, the universities and colleges had been met with to discuss how to engage with younger people and encourage them to walk and cycle, even after they had obtained driving licences.

- In response to queries about transport equity and engaging with marginalised groups, it was noted that models had been developed with references to deprivation and environment scores. These models were data driven and took into account areas with a lack of connectivity and poor environments. The primary role of the consultation was to ensure that people were heard. In addition to this, the Council ran a number of outreach programmes with marginalised groups to ensure that they had a platform to engage.
- Additionally, the Air Quality Action Plan would engage with similar groups and would include accessibility groups. This was the starting point for ongoing investigation to ensure that everybody was heard from.
- In terms of mechanisms to engage with communities, Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) groups could be used and a running demographic of those who engaged was kept so that it could be seen as to who was not engaging and as such these groups could be worked with and engaged with. It was aimed to engage through people working locally rather than via email. Additionally, Ward Councillors were worked with to ascertain whether areas needed to be engaged with. Consultations were map-based so people could click on areas to show where issues were, this was particularly useful for people for whom English was not a first language.
- In response to a point raised about digital exclusion, this could be addressed in the next report on the issue.
- Information on who was consulted about the width of cycle routes could be included in the next report.

AGREED:

- 1) That the report be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account by the lead officers.

#### **149. WORK PROGRAMME**

The work programme was noted.

#### **150. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There being no further items of urgent business, the meeting finished at 20:11.



## **Worker Exploitation Task Group**

### **Report and Recommendations**

Culture and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission  
Report of the Chair of the Economic Development, Transport and  
Climate Emergency Scrutiny Commission

University of Leicester  
Nikolaus Hammer, Joseph Choonara, Chandrima Roy, Guillaume Wilemme

Date of meeting: 23 April 2025  
Chair: Sue Waddington



# Aims

- gain an overview of sectors and practices of worker exploitation across the UK
- develop a picture of the enforcement landscape, in particular as it appears from the perspective of local authorities
- map key local stakeholders and their intelligence/systems
- on the basis of broad stakeholder consultation, establish where in Leicester worker exploitation is prevalent (e.g. across sectors, business models, communities, etc)
- recommend, specifically as regards the local authority's remit, avenues to improve a) monitoring, b) compliance, c) remedy for exploited workers



# Enforcement Gap (I)

## Breakdown of Resolution Foundation (2022) numbers for Leicester

	UK	Leicester
<b>NMW/NLW underpayment</b>	400,000	2,300
<b>No paid holiday entitlement</b>	900,000	5,200
<b>No payslip provided</b>	1,800,000	10,500
<b>Not auto-enrolled in pension scheme</b>	600,000	3,500
<b>Reported workplace discrimination</b>	8,300,000	50,000

Source: Source: Judge and Slaughter (2023, 17; Resolution Foundation)



# Enforcement Gap (II)

## Evidence from Violation Tracker database

- Labour standards violations across UK, 2020-2024: 1,607
- Labour standards violations in Leicester, 2020-2024: 7
- Statistical data are mostly estimates
- Difficulties to bring 'reported non-compliance' to 'actionable non-compliance'
- Exploitation often in grey areas of economy, drawing on vulnerable workers, difficult to access





# Findings/Sectors

- Continuum of violations of work and employment standards
- Vastly different subcontracting structures across sectors
- Social care: some LA involvement but very different forms of contracting, recruitment channels, management systems
  - Look at NW Migrant Social Care Worker Charter betw UNISON and Salford Council
- Procurement and licensing: lack of contractor and commissioner capacity in due diligence (self-reporting)
  - Look at Fair Work Wales and Fair Work Scotland frameworks
- Online platform/gig economy: most diverse and evolving
  - Suggests two-pronged top-down and bottom-up approach



# A local 'Fair Work' labour market partnership to establish robust pathways to intelligence

National level – Enforcement Agencies

- Intelligence-led
- Require hard info to turn 'reported non-compliance' into prosecutions

Local authority

- No enforcement powers (exc for HSE)
- Delegated role in economic development
- Capabilities in monitoring and partnership

Trade unions/community orgs

- Access to vulnerable workers
- Comprehensive understanding of work everyday life, cultural, etc issues



# Rationale

- Better monitoring/anticipation of issues on the ground
- Support low-level issues before they become more critical
- Signal a red line of minimum employment standards to employers and workers
- Partnerships to tackle issues before they become a public concern
- Quality evidence to feed into enforcement agencies; to demand action from enforcement agencies



# Recommendations/ Delivery

8. Designate an LCC 'Fair Work' officer for coordination and support. Specifically, to
  - a. provide a link between the local authority, community organisations, trade unions, and sector specific initiatives;
  - b. develop links with partners (trade unions, NGOs, civil society partners) in other sectors at risk (e.g. construction, nail bars);
  - c. encourage partnership working between the local initiatives and the labour market enforcement agencies within the Fair Work Agency;
  - d. support partners to secure appropriate funding.
9. Integrate the above local fair work recommendations with other local authority functions (e.g. Trading Standards, Adult Social Care, Adult Education, Schools, Economic Development and Community Safety) in building partnerships and outreach.
10. Review procurement and commissioning processes within the local authority with a view to integrate and monitor work and employment standards in supply chain due diligence.

# **Parking Fees & Charges**

Response to Call-in of Executive Decision taken  
24<sup>th</sup> March 2025 to increase parking fees and  
charges

# Summary of revised parking fees and charges (1)

- City centre tariffs to increase by ~25% for on street Pay & Display and off-street car parking
- Higher increase for Victoria Park car park to match other city centre car parks
- Discounted evening rate (Night Owl tariff) in car parks will be discontinued
- Parks car park tariffs will be increased by 10% (not 25%)

# Summary of revised parking fees and charges (2)

- Decision (made in 2022/23) to charge for street P&D parking on Sundays will be implemented
- Blue badge holders can still park for free
- The 10p convenience fee for paying by phone will be absorbed into the new tariffs
- Aim is for new fees and charges to commence on 12<sup>th</sup> May
- Annual review of charges to take account of inflation

# The need to raise charges

- Inflationary cost pressures in CCTV monitoring, 3<sup>rd</sup> party services, energy costs and infrastructure maintenance
- Cost pressures have been largely absorbed by Parking Service over a decade
- Major capital investment in recent years have improved LCC car parks to provide safer parking
- All Council car parks have Park Mark status for safe parking (a rigorous assessment by specially trained Police assessors)
- Will be only second price increase since 2014



# Financial case

- Financial position of Council requires difficult choices to be made, all services asked to find savings
- Annual saving of £1.1m of which £0.5m will cover service cost pressures
- Savings will also contribute £0.6m towards 3-year savings target of £4m for Planning, Development and Transportation
- Income from parking charges is reinvested into parking, highways and transport-related services
- Demand for parking remains strong, private operators are increasing their charges

# Proposed Parking Tariffs

Haymarket Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
1 hour	£2.00	£2.50
3 hours	£4.00	£5.00
4 hours	£5.00	£6.30
6 hours	£7.00	£8.80
9 hours	£10.00	£12.50
12 hours	£12.00	£15.00

Newarke Street Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
1 hour	£2.00	£2.50
3 hours	£4.00	£5.00
4 hours	£5.00	£6.30
6 hours	£7.00	£8.80
9 hours	£10.00	£12.50
12 hours	£12.00	£15.00

Upper Brown Street Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
1 hour	£2.00	£2.50
3 hours	£4.00	£5.00
4 hours	£5.00	£6.30

Dover Street Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
1 hour	£2.00	£2.50
3 hours	£4.00	£5.00
4 hours	£5.00	£6.30
6 hours	£7.00	£8.80
9 hours	£10.00	£12.50
12 hours	£12.00	£15.00

# Proposed Parking Tariffs

Abbey Park Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
2 hours	£2.00	£2.20
3 hours	£3.00	£3.30
4 hours	£4.00	£4.40
12 hours	£9.00	£9.90

St Margarets Pastures Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
2 hours	£2.00	£2.20
3 hours	£3.00	£3.30
4 hours	£4.00	£4.40
12 hours	£9.00	£9.90
Sunday/BH Up to 3 Hours	£1.00	£1.10
Sunday/ BH Up to 6 Hours	£3.00	£3.30

Victoria Park Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
1 hour	£1.00	£1.30
2 hours	£2.00	£2.50
3 hours	£3.00	£5.00
4 hours	£4.00	£6.30
9 hours	N/A	£12.50
12 hours	£9.00	£15.00

Watermead Park Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
2 hour	£2.00	£2.20
3 hours	£3.00	£3.30
4 hours	£4.00	£5.40
12 hours	£9.00	£9.90

# Proposed Parking Tariffs

Phoenix Car Park		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
1 hour	£2.00	£2.50
3 hours	£4.00	£5.00
4 hours	£5.00	£6.30
6 hours	£7.00	£8.80
9 hours	£10.00	£12.50
12 hours	£12.00	£15.00

On-Street Pay & Display Bays		
Time Band	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff
City Centre Inner 1 hour	£2.00	£2.50
City Centre Inner 2 hours	£3.50	£4.40
City Centre Outer 2 hour	£2.00	£2.50
City Centre Outer 3 hours	£2.50	£3.10
City Centre Long Stay 3 hours	£2.00	£2.50
City Centre Long Stay 10.5 hours	£8.00	£10.00
London Rd Outer 1 hour	£1.00	£1.30
London Rd Outer 2 hours	£2.00	£2.50
London Rd Outer 6.5 hours	£7.00	£8.80
London Rd Inner 0.5 hours	£1.00	£1.30
London Rd Inner 1 hour	£2.00	£2.50
London Rd Inner 2 hours	£3.00	£3.80
London Rd Inner 3 hours	£4.00	£5.00

# Benchmarking with other councils

Headline Benchmarking Detail	Defined Comparison (Comparable Car Park or On-Street Location)
Leicester's Council-Operated tariffs remain up to 60% lower than private sector rates in Derby and Leicester	3-hour stay: £5.00 (Leicester Council) vs £8.85–£11.85 (Private Sector)
Leicester Charges up to 45% Less for 12-Hour Stays Compared to Nottingham's Broad Marsh and Trinity CPs	£9.90–£15 (Leicester) vs £18.00 (Nottingham Council CPs)
Short-stay parking in Leicester is among the cheapest across comparable Midland cities	1-hour parking from £1.30 to £2.50 (Leicester) vs £2.40–£5.50 (Coventry, Derby, Nottingham, Private Sector)
Leicester evening parking tariffs are significantly lower than Nottingham and Derby equivalents	4-hours parking: £4.40 - £6.30 (Leicester) vs £8.00–£10.00 (Nottingham), £8.95 (Derby Private Sector)
Leicester's 2-Hour tariff in our car parks offers better value than equivalent council tariffs in Nottingham, Coventry, and Derby	£2.20–£2.50 (Leicester) vs £2.20–£5.50 (Other Neighbouring Councils)
Tariffs apply on all days, including Sundays. This is in line with neighbouring cities approach.	1-hour parking from £1.30 to £2.50 (Leicester) vs £2.40–£5.50 (Coventry, Derby, Nottingham, Private Sector)

# Call in details (1)

- *'We, the undersigned, wish to 'Call-In' the decision made by the City Mayor to increase council on street and off street parking charges. **Raising parking fees will disproportionately impact people on low-incomes, many of whom are already struggling with rising living costs and increased council tax payments.** Since the Labour government took office, financial pressures have increased significantly, with last week's Spring Statement bringing further economic strain with reduced help and support. Increasing parking fees will add yet another burden to those who can least afford it.*

# Response (1) - Support for People on Low Incomes

- One third (33%) of Leicester households do not own a car, well above England average 24%
- Bus travel is comparatively affordable for people on low income
- Fare cap £3, concessionary bus passengers travel for free
- Park & Ride buses run every 15 mins, 7am to 7pm, Mon to Sat
- P&R tickets: Individual Day £3.50, Group Day £4, Senior/disabled £1
- Hop! - Free City Centre Circular bus every 10 mins
- High quality cycling and walking routes enable free travel into city centre
- Blue badge holders park for free at all times

## Call in details (2)

- *Beyond harming residents, these proposed changes will have a wider negative impact on the city centre's economy. The reason for this is clear. Leicester's high parking charges are literally driving business and customers away to Fosse Park, which offers free, convenient and safe parking and is just a few minutes away from the city centre. If the council considered reducing parking fees it could actually see an increase in revenue. Attracting more visitors to Leicester would be good for local businesses and it would help to revitalise the city centre. Yet the council seems intent on doing the opposite, making it increasingly unaffordable to park in Leicester, which will result in further economic decline, with more businesses and customers moving to Fosse Park.*



# Response (2) – Impact of City Centre's Economy

- Demand and occupancy levels are very high in Council car parks
- We remain price competitive compared to other parking providers
- Many car parks operated by private operators do not offer the same quality provision
- Of 11,200 off-street, car park spaces in the city centre, Council operates just 1,750 (16%). Majority operated by private sector
- Central location offers more and easier options for access by bus, cycling and walking
- Income from parking fees supports highway and traffic management services critical to support local businesses and economic growth

## Call in details (3)

- *We also oppose the proposed removal of the "Night Owl" reduced parking rates, as this would harm the nighttime economy.* Instead of deterring evening visitors, the council should be encouraging them. Raising parking fees at this time is a bad decision which will hurt residents, businesses and the city's economy. We respectfully request that the council reconsider the proposals to increase charges and instead starts to adopt policies that will boost investment and encourage economic growth, rather than pricing people out of the city centre.'

# Response (3) –Evening Parking & Night-time economy

- Evening parking on city centre streets will remain free to help support the night-time economy
- Car Parks will also remain open in the evenings
- Car Parks provide a secure parking environment in the evenings
- There is a cost to manage and provide car parks in the evenings
- Unlike Fosse Park, the city centre delivers much more than retail
- Leicester city centre offers a diverse retail, cultural and leisure visitor experience to bolster the night-time economy, for example the recent Light Up Leicester festival attracted 93,500 visitors to the City

# Recommendation for Scrutiny

- Scrutiny to Resolve that the call-in be withdrawn
- Agreement for withdrawal:
  - Will stop the call in process
  - Call-in will not be considered at a future meeting of Full Council
  - Original decision will take immediate effect without amendment