



EXECUTIVE BOARD DECISION

REPORT OF: Executive Member for Regeneration

LEAD OFFICER: Director of Planning and Prosperity

DATE: 8 December 2016

PORTFOLIO/S AFFECTED: Regeneration

WARD/S AFFECTED: All

KEY DECISION: YES NO

SUBJECT: Residents Parking Scheme Policy

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Residents Parking Scheme Policy sets out appropriate guidelines and criteria for such schemes and is now due for review. This has been highlighted by a recent complaint regarding implementation of a local scheme.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Executive Board:
Approve the proposed policy for Resident Parking Schemes

3. BACKGROUND

Further to a recent Stage 2 complaint regarding the implementation of the Residents Parking Scheme in the Shear Brow area, it was agreed that the existing policy was due for review.

The review would need to focus on residential consultation and subsequent implementation based on results.

4. KEY ISSUES

The objective of Residents Parking Schemes is generally to safeguard the amenity of residential areas. This is achieved by removing non-resident parking. In order to be successful Residents Parking Schemes require an adequate enforcement regime to deter this additional parking. This enforcement is provided by the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's) under the Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) powers of the council. Under legislation when a Council takes on CPE, it has to be demonstrated that it is self-funding. Conversely it is also not meant to be used as an income generator, i.e. ideally it should be break even. In this respect therefore any Residents Parking Scheme should also be self-funding.

Currently, residents are offered a fixed number of permits at fixed costs with no consideration as to the likely level of enforcement costs for the scheme. Despite this lack of detailed analysis, current schemes have tended to almost be self-financing due to the size of the schemes and the ability for the CEO's to incorporate enforcement into their normal town centre routes.

Increasingly however, requests are being received for Residents Parking Schemes to be introduced in smaller areas away from the current main areas of enforcement which would inevitably lead to higher enforcement costs. The proposed policy looks to address these issues by being more robust when designing and costing a scheme, tailoring the number of permits issued and their cost to each individual scheme.

Finally, and most importantly however, the proposed policy sets down strict criteria for residents support for schemes. Whilst the proposed policy sets down a minimum level of residents support required before a scheme will be considered the major change in policy is the level of support required before a scheme will be implemented.

Residents have always been consulted before the introduction of any scheme which subsequently were only implemented if the majority of residents were in favour; a ratio of 2:1 in favour was generally used but this was not formally documented.

Historically, only the responses received have been analysed to see if an area was in favour. Under the new policy the percentage of those in favour will be calculated against the total number of those consulted as the basis for residents support of the scheme, with the level of support required for the introduction of a scheme being 70%, i.e. approx 2:1 as before. This method of calculation is that used by the majority of other traffic authorities.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The proposed policy tightens up on eligibility criteria, etc., making the process more auditable and fulfilling the requirements of the Stage 2 complaint recommendations.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed policy seeks to ensure that any residents parking scheme introduced is self-financing thus meeting the requirements of TMA 2004.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The Council provide Civil Parking Enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA 2004) which requires that it be self-financing.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Any future resource implications will be factored into the cost of individual schemes.

9. EQUALITY AND HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

Please select one of the options below. Where appropriate please include the hyperlink to the EIA.

Option 1 Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) not required – the EIA checklist has been completed.

Option 2 In determining this matter the Executive Member needs to consider the EIA associated with this item in advance of making the decision. (*insert EIA link here*)

Option 3 In determining this matter the Executive Board members need to consider the EIA associated with this item in advance of making the decision. (*insert EIA attachment*)

10. CONSULTATIONS

Members

11. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The recommendations are made further to advice from the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer has confirmed that they do not incur unlawful expenditure. They are also compliant with equality legislation and an equality analysis and impact assessment has been considered. The recommendations reflect the core principles of good governance set out in the Council's Code of Corporate Governance.

12. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

All Declarations of Interest of any Executive Member consulted and note of any dispensation granted by the Chief Executive will be recorded in the Summary of Decisions published on the day following the meeting.

VERSION:	0.02
-----------------	------

CONTACT OFFICER:	George Bell
-------------------------	-------------

DATE:	21 st September 2016
--------------	---------------------------------

BACKGROUND PAPER:	
--------------------------	--

