

DECISION-MAKER:	INTERIM DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY		
SUBJECT:	CHARGING FOR RESIDENTS FIRST PARKING PERMITS		
DATE OF DECISION:	15 OCTOBER 2013		
REPORT OF:	HEAD OF TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND PARKING		
<u>CONTACT DETAILS</u>			
AUTHOR:	Name:	John Harvey	Tel: 023 8083 3927
	E-mail:	john.harvey@southampton.gov.uk	
Director	Name:	John Tunney	Tel: 023 8083 4428
	E-mail:	john.tunney@southampton.gov.uk	

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY
None

BRIEF SUMMARY

The Cabinet, on 16th July, delegated authority to the Director of Environment and Economy to advertise the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) and consider and determine any representations received to those proposals in accordance with the Council's procedures for determining Traffic Regulation Orders.

The proposals to charge £30 per year for first Resident's Permits and £15 for Temporary Resident's Permits valid for 3 months were advertised on the 16th August. In response, the Council has received 828 representations with concerns or objections, which have been summarised and reviewed as part of this report. This report is presented to the Director for Environment & Economy for the representations to be considered and the matter to be determined.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) To approve the introduction of a £30 per year charge for renewals and new applications for First Resident Permits effective from 1st November 2013;
- (ii) To approve the introduction of a £15 charge for Temporary Resident Permits for first time applicants with a validity of 3 months, effective from 1st November 2013;
- (iii) To ensure that future Civil Parking Enforcement Annual Reports include details of permit income and costs in Residents Parking Zones, which will then be used as material consideration for any future variations in permit charges;
- (iv) To ensure that funding contributions are requested for Traffic Regulation Orders, in the form of parking restrictions, for developments where it is deemed appropriate to do so to mitigate

against the impact of the development on the safety and amenity of local residents;

- (v) To review and update the Council's Resident Parking Scheme operational strategy in early 2014 to ensure that it reflects the current parking issues, community needs and sustainable travel policies. This will be used as the basis for review of existing Zones and the consideration of future requests; and
- (vi) To undertake a phased series of surveys, commencing in early 2014, of residents (Z1-12 & 16) eligible for First Residents Permits over whether they would wish their residents parking scheme to be changed or removed. Also to prioritise any changes to the existing scheme restrictions, over any possible expansion of Zones 1-12 & 16.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 Cabinet have approved the principle of introducing charges for First Resident's Permits in order that the schemes have a higher level of self-funding.
- 2 Cabinet has also approved the principle of introducing charges for Temporary Resident's Permits in order that the full cost of administration and issue are met.
- 3 There is a need to ensure that the assessment and justification for permit charges are transparent, so that residents may benefit from improvements in how the schemes are operated.
- 4 Members of the public have concerns that the expansion of the Southampton General Hospital and the University of Southampton, without adequate parking or travel arrangements is the root cause of many parking problems and there is therefore a need to ensure future development at these key sites is undertaken having regard to the impact on residents and parking.
- 5 There are significant concerns raised by residents as to whether the existing permit restrictions are still appropriate or whether they need to be amended or removed, subject to due process in the various zones.
- 6 Previous Council policy and practice has been driven by the need to deter weekday, non-resident/commuter parking, rather than the increasing issue of excess levels of resident parking overnight or at week-ends

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 7 Not introducing these charges was rejected on the basis that the costs would otherwise have to be met by further Council subsidy funded by service reductions elsewhere such as further reductions in enforcement costs or by reducing expenditure in other priority areas such as CCTV. In the current budget restricted environment if a proportion of costs are not recoverable, then the council may not be able to implement new Residents parking Schemes or manage existing ones properly resulting on a detrimental impact on resident amenity and safety.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

THE PROPOSAL

8 The proposal is to change two specific elements of the charging regime for Residents Parking Permits in Zones 1 -12 &16. The table below shows the current and proposed charges for Permits.

9

Permit	Existing charge	Proposed charge
1 st Resident Permit	£0	£30
2 nd Resident permit	£30	No change
Temporary Resident Permit (3 months)	£0	£15
Visitor Permit (annual)	£30	No change
Visitor Permit (day)	£6 for ten days	No change
All other permits		No change

CONSULTATION & LEGAL PROCESS

10 The Public Notice was advertised on 16th August in the Daily Echo and Hampshire Independent in accordance with the statutory requirements under the Road Traffic regulation Act 1994. In addition to the normal statutory requirements, letters (see Appendix 1) were also sent highlighting the consultation to all households eligible for first resident permits in Zones 1-12 & 16 (see map at Appendix 2).

REPRESENTATIONS – SUMMARY

11 In response to the Public Notice, Legal HR & Democratic Services received 828 representations objecting to or expressing concerns over the proposals. The representations were registered numerically and are filed in the Supplementary Appendix. The points of objection are also tabulated at Appendix 3 and summarised below.

12 Whilst most residents appreciated the opportunity to make representations to the Council on this issue, some expressed strong disagreement with the proposals themselves. For the main part, representations were made in relation to the principle of introducing new permit charges or in reference to first Resident Permit Charges.

13 The main part of this report addresses the proposals overall, relevant material policy and financial considerations and the scale of representations from respondents. Resident Associations, petitions and Ward Councillors have also made representations and these have been presented at Appendix 4, rather than being included within the summary table at Appendix 3. These also constitute valid objection / representations and are simply separated out for ease of reference

REPRESENTATIONS - LEGAL

14 A number of residents (11) highlighted concerns over the 21 day consultation period taking place over summer leave period. Also residents (9) argued that

either the letter should have been sent to a named addressee or that it arrived after the commencement date or was not received.

- 15 There were also questions over whether the matter should be decided by Cabinet in a public forum (4) or that the proposals should have been in the party manifesto (2) or why the consultation was taking place, if the Council has already decided the matter (1) (There were also concerns as to whether the Council should or shouldn't be using the City Web as part of the consultation process (2))
- 16 Otherwise respondent's (60) primary concern was the inadequacy of any explanation or case for the proposed charges (e.g. for example the absence of a financial balance sheet) and / or reference to legality of the proposing charges given the recent High Court case decision against Barnet Council for raising proposed permit charges. (See response summary at Appendix 3).

OFFICERS RESPONSE - LEGAL

- 17 Council decision making and consultations takes place throughout the year and, with the limited exception of public bank holidays, is not required to take into account seasonal considerations. Residents and business may have holidays and other commitments at any time of the year and it is not possible for the Council to take every possibility into account or to limit its decision making and consultation processes to exclude the summer period. All statutory requirements required to be met under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1994 in relation to the advertising of these proposals have been met. Notwithstanding that, the Council has taken representations in this regard into account and, at its discretion, agreed to accept representations until 13th September to assist residents who indicated they were not able to respond earlier. The high level of representations received on this occasion is a good indication that the proposals have been widely advertised and received and that residents have been able to present their views within the time allowed.
- 18 Cabinet have agreed the proposals in principle subject to normal statutory advertisement procedures and consideration of representations. Cabinet specifically delegated the consideration of objections and the final decision on whether or not to implement the proposals to Officers as it is lawfully permitted to do under the Local Government Act 2000. The final decision on whether or not to implement the objections, taking into account all material considerations including all representations received, therefore lawfully rests with Officers following consideration of this report. The statutory basis for Officers to take a decision such as this is therefore fully met.
- 19 Given the range of questions raised in the representations, the Council has also provided collective response to residents clarifying the proposals and providing further information on the basis of the proposals (see letter at Appendix 8 and information at Appendix 9).
- 20 The main representations received queried whether the Council is legally entitled to introduce these charges. The statutory powers to implement the charges are detailed in paragraphs 81 and 82 below.

REPRESENTATIONS - FINANCIAL

- 21 The highest level of concerns (285) raised within the objections relate to the

funding or the financial motive behind the proposals. In particular respondents (132) highlighted that this was a revenue or tax levying measure by the Council to compensate for reductions in government funding.

- 22 Respondents (172) also felt strongly that the costs of running schemes should already be met through other means, e.g. council tax, rent, income tax, vehicle excise duty, parking charges, permit charges and revenue from penalty notices.
- 23 There were concerns to the extent that the Council is seeking to increase the contribution from residents towards the cost of permit parking schemes by this additional First Permit charge.
- 24 Certain respondents questioned how the Council could possibly justify these proposals with surpluses of £1.04M and £2.4M on its On- Street and Off-Street published accounts, respectively. A number of respondents (10) also raised concerns over the absence of any commitment of where the revenue would be spent and / or whether there would be future increases in the permit charge (23). Otherwise some residents (11) did indicate that a smaller charge may have been acceptable.
- 25 Another area of concern raised by respondents was that the costs of the schemes should be met by existing permit charges and in particular from the Visitor Permit charges introduced in 2011.

OFFICER RESPONSE - FINANCIAL

- 26 The Schemes benefit only a small proportion of the City population. For fairness reasons it is not appropriate for the schemes to be funded by council taxes which apply to all. The provision of Residents Parking Schemes costs £260k per year for administration and £112k for enforcement (2012/13). This proposal brings in income of £130k meaning that this parking service remains subsidised. Only a proportion of the costs of the scheme would be met by the proposed increase in charges.
- 27 A high number of respondents argued that permit parking schemes should be funded by "Road Tax" (or Vehicle Excise Duty as it is now defined. This duty is however collected by central government. (i.e. the Duty income is not passed on to Local Authorities to be dedicated to parking or highway expenditure).
- 28 There is an understandable question as to why the Council should propose these charges when it makes a surplus on On-Street Parking and Off-Street Parking. Any On-Street parking surplus has to be spent on parking, the highway or its environment strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1994 (see further legal paragraph below). Currently this surplus is used to help fund on and on street general public parking provision in the City and , where a surplus is generated having deducted those costs, other key transport and highway related services including CCTV monitoring and enforcement of transport matters and other similar schemes (see Appendix 9). The Off-Street surplus is legally allowed to be used more widely and supports the provision of Council services in general, which would otherwise have to be reduced or cut.
- 29 It is for the Council to prioritise the services it provides within available

funding. Many respondents highlighted in their correspondence concerns over highway maintenance and a point made by the Local Government Association in March 2013 that the surplus made by all English Councils in 2011/12 from On-Street / Off-Street parking of £411m needed to be seen in the context of overall Council spending on transport and highways of £8.11m

30 The last review of residents permit charges was in 2011.

31 At that time there was a high level of concerns about the misuse of (day) Visitor Permits and the cost of printing these permits (£55k in 2010/11)

32 The 2011 changes were therefore primarily intended to reduce cost and reduce misuse. Also, it was intended to share more widely the contribution to operating the schemes, with the cost of second Resident's permits being reduced from £60 to £30 at that time.

33 Permit parking schemes have not been introduced for the purpose of raising revenue, as they incur a net cost to the Council. Schemes are only introduced following statutory consultation with residents and where there is a demonstrable need to control demand for parking. The Council can however appreciate that there are concerns looking at comparative resident permits elsewhere (e.g. as one respondent highlighted £90 in Brighton) that these charges may increase over time. There are currently no further increases in permit costs under consideration.

34 Funding transparency can best be addressed by providing accounts in the future of the operation of these schemes, so that residents can view where the money is being spent and that no undue charges are being incurred. It is important that there is confidence in the management of these schemes.

REPRESENTATIONS - FAIRNESS

35 The second of highest level of concerns (260) raised within the objections relate to the fairness of the proposals. In particular respondents (139) expressed strong views that it was unfair for the costs of the scheme to be met by the lower income households without off-street parking for whom the charges in the current economic situation are unaffordable.

36 Residents also noted the removal of the 10% Council tax discount for pensioners, new charges for the disposal of green waste and other increasing living costs, for communities on fixed incomes (e.g. pensions or earnings without pay increases).

37 It is understandable that with the increasing financial pressures on households, residents are concerned about being able to afford these new charges.

38 Another argument presented by many residents (127), was that it is not right to charge people for parking a vehicle outside their own home. Residents (47) also highlighted that it was in unfair for some residents to have to pay to park on-street, when residents in other areas of the City do not.

OFFICER RESPONSE - FAIRNESS

39 The First Permit charge of £30 per year equates to £1.20 per week and is therefore a small element of the running costs of a motor vehicle. Given the concerns received about the ability to pay this amount, it is proposed to

explore mechanisms to allow staged payments to spread the cost for low income groups.

40 There is no legal right to park your car outside your home, although many residents clearly enjoy this facility where demand for parking is low. Where parking regulations are required for congestion reduction or safety, parking demand and turnover can be controlled by permit restrictions.

41 First Permits will allow residents access to available parking spaces during the times of operation of the scheme.

REPRESENTATIONS - PLANNING

42 Another area of concern raised by respondents (85) was that the parking problems in their locality were not of their making and that the Council should address the problems at source, rather than charging residents. Residents (34) highlighted that the Council's planning policy had allowed the growth of new developments and HMOs without adequate parking off-street.

43 Respondents (39) in Zone 6 and Zones 9-12 argued that it was the Council's responsibility to either make the University of Southampton (UoS) provide adequate parking (or utilise existing parking) to address the on-street parking problems of their making or make the UoS pay to fund these permit parking schemes through development funding. Residents also expressed frustration at the social problems they experienced through living in proximity to UoS.

44 Residents in Zone 7 (18) considered that the Council should make the NHS fund the cost of the scheme around the General Hospital or make the General Hospital provide adequate staff parking. Respondents in this locality also expressed concern that it was wrong for local residents to suffer from the proximity of the General Hospital, when this facility served the city and a wider regional community. Similar objections were raised by two Ward Councillors (see Appendix 4).

45 A number of residents questioned why if the Stadium scheme was funded by the Southampton Football Club does this principle not apply around the General Hospital and UoS.

OFFICER RESPONSE - PLANNING

46 In considering new developments, the council works with developers to assess transport impact and mitigate them within the context of national legal and policy restrictions as well as local planning policies. The council is committed to making such developments sustainable and has parking standards it publishes and uses. It is also working closely with the University and Hospital on their travel plans.

47 Both the University and Hospital travel demands result in spill over parking demand. In both cases travel plans and strategies are deployed to mitigate and manage travel. In some cases they have paid for Residents Parking Schemes to be implemented.

48 The Council has introduced new Parking Standards for developments (9/2011) which seeks to address this problem in future developments.

49 The Council is also applying the Mandatory HMO licensing levels which came into force on the 6 April 2006. This has introduced additional HMO licensing in

four wards of the city - Bargate, Bevois, Swaythling and Portswood (7/2013).

50 The Council will continue to secure contributions from developments towards existing and new Residents Parking Schemes where the legal tests are met. The implementation of CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) for calculating the levels of contributions will ensure a consistent approach to developments in the future. Site specific contributions to local issues will still be possible although these will be less common.

51 The Residents Parking Schemes around the Southampton Football Club were introduced as a direct result of the Club constructing a new stadium in an inner city area with direct impact on local residents. They only operate on match days where there are demonstrable demand issues arising from spectator demand and are funded by the Club.

REPRESENTATIONS - PERMIT PARKING

52 252 respondents raised objections or qualified their objections in relation to the permit schemes. Many of the respondents (115) expressed dissatisfaction with the service provided by the schemes. The main concern (71) was that the schemes were not perceived as being adequately enforced.

53 Respondents (64) indicated that a charge might be acceptable if residents (or their visitors) were able to park their vehicle near their property (60) and this point was similarly reflected in representations (55) that the restrictions needed to be changed (e.g. operate into the evening, weekends or become permit parking only) for the schemes to be effective.

54 Other respondents (52) requested the restrictions be removed on the basis that they were opposed, not consulted over or only accepted on the basis that there would not be a cost for residents. In some cases respondents questioned whether there was ever a need for the restrictions in their street.

55 A number of respondents also were concerned over the unintended consequences that would arise from these charges, including the loss of front gardens (15) and the displacement of vehicles to unrestricted roads or onto lengths of waiting restrictions (13). Some respondents (4) also argued that the charges could depress property prices or questioned the exclusion of the Stadium Scheme from the permit charging proposals.

OFFICER RESPONSE – PERMIT PARKING

56 The representations regarding the permit parking schemes themselves have been highly informative. In recent years, the Council has concentrated its resources on extending the coverage of these schemes where requested by local communities. In doing so it is apparent that we have not reviewed the operation of the existing schemes. Although the respondents are only a sample of eligible residents for permits, there is apparent dissatisfaction with the amount of enforcement, the hours/days the schemes operate and the type of restriction (e.g. with 2hour limited waiting) in all areas.

57 Around 40% of Civil Enforcement Officers time is spent enforcing these Zones. It may be that the enforcement activity is not observed by those residents who are out of their homes during the day.

58 There were concerns expressed to suggest that in some roads or localities

permit parking is no longer required. It is therefore clear that whatever the outcome of this decision process, that further consultation is required on the design and scope of the existing schemes to ensure they remain necessary and fit for purpose going forward.

59 It is not feasible to guarantee a parking place or provide dedicated bays for households as demand far exceeds available road space and layout. There is an understandable concern over resident's paying for parking permit when they are unable to park near their property. This needs to be understood better, to see whether for example extended hours could practically help address this concern.

60 The criteria for resident parking schemes need to be reviewed, together with criteria for amending or removing restrictions. This can also be more problematic where these restrictions are more fragmented as in Z16, the Shirley Area

61 The Stadium scheme was not included in these proposals as it only operates during events and is funded by Southampton Football Club, following its relocation to St Mary's.

REPRESENTATIONS - PUBLIC TRANSPORT & OTHER BENEFITS

62 Many respondents (78) were critical of Council suggesting that permit restrictions or charges would promote public transport, improve road safety, reduce carbon emissions or reduce obstructive parking. Respondents (38) were critical of the Council's view that buses were a viable option given the cost, inflexibility and adequacy of services. A number of residents also questioned the Council's commitment to this policy given the recent cuts in Council subsidies (£404K for 2013/14) and loss of services (see Appendix 5)

63 Residents highlighted that local bus services are now being removed, are unsuitable for many journeys and / or prohibitively costly. Residents (28) also considered that a car remained essential for most families.

OFFICER RESPONSE – PUBLIC TRANSPORT & OTHER BENEFITS

64 Many Resident Parking Zones were designed to deter non-resident or commuter parking around major attractions in the city where demand for parking exceeds space available. The Uni-Link bus service grew from 1m to 4m passengers during the previous decade and is an example of how these schemes can help support local bus services. This also reduces traffic, congestion and carbon emissions around the University and wider city.

65 The Permit schemes assist the demand for day time bus services to the city centre. The General Hospital and UoS permit schemes encourage many commuters to use public transport.

REPRESENTATIONS - TEMPORARY RESIDENTS PERMITS

66 Whilst most representations objected to the principle of introducing new permit charges, there were a relatively low number (18) of specific references to Temporary Resident's Permits. A number of respondents (17) highlighted that there should be no charges for these permits, or that the charges were excessive (6). Other residents however were concerned about the misuse of these permits (2), or advised that they had no issue with the proposed charge

(6).

67 A number of respondents (12) had misunderstood that these permits were in some way a replacement for Visitor permits or second Resident's Parking Permits or did not understand the purpose of these permits (3). There were individual concerns about these permits being issued to non UK registered vehicles, that the charges could increase over time or that this would add to the administration costs (see summary at Appendix 6).

68 Newtown Residents' Association highlighted that many people taking advantage of this facility will then pay the further charge for a Resident's Parking Permit.

69 There were also concerns from some residents and the East Basset Resident's Association over misuse of these permits.

70 Foreign vehicles owners will only be allowed to apply for a total of 6 months Temporary Residents Permits.

OFFICER RESPONSE - TEMPORARY RESIDENT PERMITS

71 The Council considers that these permits are a necessity for many residents when they are moving residence.

72 The charge will encourage people to apply for a First Residents Permit in a timely manner and avoid the need for a temporary Resident permit, thus avoiding the need to apply for both.

73 The Council considers that misuse of these permits will reduce if a charge is applied.

74 Overall, it is expected that the introduction of this charge will reduce the number of Temporary Resident's Permits issued (2,483 in 2012/13) as well as off-setting the administration costs.

REPRESENTATIONS - ALTERNATIVES

75 Respondents highlighted a range of preferred alternatives (see Appendix 7) of which the most common were increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of enforcement (26), reducing unnecessary Council expenditure (24) and / or increasing the charge for second permits (19). A number of respondents (18) also highlighted that there should be a reduced charge for senior citizens or people on low incomes or that occasional users should be exempt.

OFFICER RESPONSE - ALTERNATIVES

76 There are a range of alternative options that residents have suggested. Some such as increasing the charge for penalty charge notices are outside of Council control. Others such as increasing the charge for second Resident's Permits would need to be part of wider consultation. The Council budget proposals for 2013/14 were open to public consultation and it is through this opportunity that members of the public can highlight areas where they consider expenditure could be reduced or redirected.

77 The requests for enforcement 7 days a week, 24 hours a day would be prohibitively costly to introduce.

78 To Improve the cost-effectiveness of the management, administration and

enforcement of permit parking schemes, the council is intending to

- automate the issue of permits
- investigate longer term permits (more than 12 months)
- Review the existing schemes
- Communicate with residents better

79 It is not Council policy to differentiate charges for parking in Residents parking Schemes by occupation, age, religion, income or type of residence. (see Appendix 10)

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

85 The **current annual cost** of administering the issue of permits and managing the Residents Parking Schemes in the City is:-

	EXPENDITURE	INCOME	BALANCE
Administering permit applications and issuing permits	£135,000		
Traffic Regulation Orders and permit enquiries:	£30,000		
Signs, lines and scheme maintenance	£60,000		
Web management and IT systems support	£25,000		
Legal costs	£10,000		
2 nd Resident and business permits		£26,000	
Visitors and annual visitors permits		£48,000	
	£260,000	£74,000	£-186,000

86 The **proposed annual cost** of administering the issue of permits and managing the Residents Parking Schemes in the City is expected to be:-

	EXPENDITURE	INCOME	BALANCE
Administering permit applications and issuing permits	£135,000		
Traffic Regulation Orders and permit enquiries:	£30,000		
Signs, lines and scheme maintenance	£60,000		
Web management and IT systems support	£25,000		
Legal costs	£10,000		
2 nd Resident and business permits		£26,000	
Visitors and annual visitors permits		£48,000	
First Permits ¹		£130,000	
	£260,000	£204,000	£-56,000

In addition to the administration and permit costs, there are costs to enforcing these schemes. The net cost to the Council of enforcing the schemes in 2012/13 was £112,573.

Property/Other

87 None

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

88 Southampton City Council is the Local Transport Authority for the City and as such has the powers to implement Traffic Regulation Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

89 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 enables the introduction of permit charges as part of a Traffic Regulation Order to control parking.

Southampton City Council's on-street parking charges are set having regard to s122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984). On street parking surplus use is subject to the restrictions set out in s.55 RTRA 1984. . When setting charges the council does so in line with its published parking policies and the needs and demands of traffic and parking management first and foremost. Charges are set at a level that seeks to ensure the administration and enforcement of both on and off street parking are, as far as possible, self funding and not subsidised from other council funds.

Parking charges and enforcement activities are essential to keep traffic moving and avoid congestion and also improve road safety and manage demand for road space effectively, including supporting local businesses. Management of parking in the city also assists with promoting modal shift and reducing carbon emissions and takes into account the availability or otherwise of alternative parking facilities.

Southampton City Council parking revenue is used to pay for the parking service (both on and off street). Any surplus, if generated, is used in accordance with s.55 RTRA 1984 and goes towards highways and transport services such as supporting the maintenance of roads and footpaths, supporting bus services, and funding transport and highway improvement schemes across the city

Other Legal Implications:

90 In preparing and determining the proposals set out in this report the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of Equalities legislation, the Human Rights Act 1988 and s.17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (the duty to have regard to the need to remove or reduce crime and disorder in the area).

91 Parking is not in and of itself a property right. Any change to on street parking arrangements does not therefore constitute an undue interference with the property rights protected by the Human Rights Act 1998.

92 However, it is recognised that the availability of parking can have an indirect impact on property rights. The proposals in this report, and any interference with any individuals expectations in relation to parking or how that may affect their properties, are considered necessary and proportionate in order to

maintain the effective operation of area-wide permit parking schemes in the City where demand exceeds available space.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

- 93 The Parking Policy is compatible with the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and also the Local development Plan (LDP), these being the statutory planning documents for the City, and form part of the Council’s Policy framework.
- 94 The Parking Policy takes into account how parking contributes towards the achievement of wider policy objectives such as promoting economic development, reducing environmental impact and improving standards of health.

KEY DECISION? Yes

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	All
------------------------------------	-----

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

1.	Letter advising Residents of proposed new Permit Charges
2.	Map of Zones 1-12 and 16
3.	Summary of Representations (General)
4.	Representations from Resident Associations, Petitions & Ward Cllrs
5.	Table of Bus Services with service changes July 2013
6.	Summary of Representations on Temporary Resident's Permits
7.	Alternatives to introducing new permit charges
8.	Letter / Email to Respondents
9.	Supporting Financial Information
10.	Integrated Impact Assessment

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	None
----	------

Equality Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) to be carried out.	Yes
--	-----

Other Background Documents

Equality Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	Original correspondence
2.	Correspondence received after the acceptance date
3.	Pertinent correspondence received after publication of this report
4.	Parking Policy –Provision and Management 2008
5.	Local Transport Plan
6.	Local Development Plan
7.	The Councils Civil Parking Enforcement income and expenditure annual report 2011/12