

SUBJECT:	RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME - PROPOSAL FOR OPERATIONAL POLICY ADJUSTMENTS
DIRECTORATE:	COMMUNITIES & ENVIRONMENT
REPORT AUTHOR:	STEVE BIRD. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES AND STREET SCENE

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To identify an emerging issue with some Resident Parking Scheme (RPS) areas, and to propose two changes to operational policy so as to try to alleviate these pressures.

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 This report identifies pressures on the current RPS areas.
- 2.2 It suggests a way of changing the operating policies for the scheme in two ways to alleviate the pressures: a) Reduce the maximum number of permits a residence can have from 3 to 2. b) Extend the operating hours for the schemes from 6pm to 8pm.
- 2.3 It recognises that other ideas may come forwards from time to time that would support the principles of constant improvement.

3. Background

- 3.1 The development and implementation of Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) in Lincoln has been well established over many years, and is now in place in 19 zones, covering a significant part of the city. Although no resident would wish to pay for on-street parking, it is generally acknowledged that in order to defend residents' ability to find a place to park near their homes, then an authorisation scheme has to be operated, and that there is a cost to this. Once in place, traditionally the schemes have had few complaints.
- 3.2 Under the terms of the existing RPS a residence may apply for up to three passes, but there are no restrictions on the overall number of passes issued for a given scheme/area (a residence being one household). It is often the case therefore that there are more passes issued than spaces available. This is made clear at the time a pass is purchased, and those buying into a scheme are clear that having a pass does not guarantee you a parking space.
- 3.3 Although this hasn't been reported as a problem previously, in recent months the Council, through some members, has started to receive complaints that schemes are becoming overpopulated in their areas, and as a consequence aren't providing the parking opportunities for local residents as intended.

- 3.4 It is acknowledged that as well as the total number of spaces that can be available in an areas being limited, the numbers of cars in use continues to rise. These factors mean that greater pressures are now applied to these schemes than at any time before, and it is understood that this trend is likely to continue.
- 3.5 Additionally, as a result of these increasing pressures, the times at which people are seeking parking opportunities seems to be being stretched. It is noted that the existing schemes operate between 8am and 6pm on all days except Sunday, meaning that only permit holders can park at these times. It is suggested that increasingly people are returning from work after 6pm, or wanting to go shopping after 6pm, adding further to the pressures.
- 3.6 In essence the problems are identified as being twofold:
- a) Too many permit holding vehicles for the spaces available
 - b) Spaces are not available for permit holders' vehicles at the times most popularly required.

3.7 The current numbers of permits issued is as below:

1 permit	2 permits	3 permits	Total Permits
1262	521	302	3210

4. The Proposal

- 4.1 In order to try and tackle these issues constructively, two changes to the existing operating schemes are proposed.
- a) The existing maximum number of permits available to any single residence be restricted. Currently there is a maximum of three permits per residence. 302 residences currently buy three permits. A reduction to a maximum of two permits would therefore reduce demand at zone operating times by this number.
 - b) The operating times for the zones be extended to 8pm. This would reduce demand from opportunist parkers for such as late evening shopping.
- 4.2 It is recognised that other ideas may emerge at any time to improve the effective running of the schemes. The council would wish to consider these carefully, and seek further adjustments potentially, in the spirit of continuous improvement.
- 4.3 As RPS areas are on-street and governed by highways legislation, then these changes could only be brought about through working with the County Council in its role as Highways authority; the legal owners of the scheme.
- 4.4 Should the City Council support the proposed changes 'in principle' then this would have to be referred to the County Council to action.
- 4.5 As any changes of this nature would have to be consulted upon, and the results analysed, there would be a cost to exploring the opportunities for change. See the financial section below.

- 4.6 At its meeting of 7th June, the Council's Policy Scrutiny Committee considered the issues in this report and raised no objections. They asked for consideration to be given to increasing the charge for a third permit to control applications, as opposed to its blanket removal.

5. Strategic Priorities

5.1 Growing the local economy

An important part of the Council's agenda for growth is the recognition that transport links and traffic flows can have a significant impact on the economy of an area. Additionally it recognises the importance of protecting residential quality of life to encourage those with desirable skills sets to see Lincoln as a great place to live/work. The Council car parking policy is integral to this work.

6. Organisational Impacts

6.1.1 Finance

The consultation work required for all RPS areas in the city is forecast to cost between £3,000 and £4,000 if undertaken by the County Council's highways section. Costs could be higher relative to the quantities of responses received. If undertaken by the City Council (which would require the County Council's agreement) the cost would be around £2,000. However, there is a cost to implementation, which would include changing all signs. Costs for this could be as high as £20,000, although the highways authority will not commit at this time.

- 6.1.2 If supported 'in principle', and ultimately supported by the Executive, then the £2,000 for the City Council to undertake the consultations, could be found from RPS income. The cost to implement the wider scheme, if supported by RPS members, would need to be worked up in detail, and similarly found from the RPS income budget. This gives an option to spread costs over future years. Assessment of the priority to do this would depend on the priority given to this work when assessed against other demands on that same budget. A timetable for any implementation would therefore be subject to support of the Executive, support from RPS scheme members under a consultation, and ultimately availability of budget.

6.2 Legal Implications including Procurement Rules

The operation of RPS is in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004. Consultation is required on any changes to an RPS operating policy, and as the highways authority are the 'owners' of any such scheme, they are the only body who can make changes under the Act. Any changes must be publicised.

6.3 Human Resources

Enforcement of RPS zones is undertaken by the County Council through its contractor for on-street enforcement. Administration of the scheme is undertaken by the City Council, and as changes would not require a greater number of passes to be issued, there would be no significant impact on either the duties of staff, or the volumes of work they undertake.

6.4 Equality, Diversity and Human Rights

RPS assists those who need to park nearer to their homes, for example those with

a disability. See the attached EIA.

6.5 Significant Community Impact.

This report has arisen as a result of community pressures brought to the attention of some members. Mitigation within RPS areas would therefore support local communities and reduce these pressures/tensions.

7. Risk Implications

7.1 (i) Options Explored

No change- this has no impact on the problems identified.

Consult on partial change- this would miss the broader opportunities, but may be an outcome from the consultation.

Consult on two changes- this is as per the main report.

7.2 (ii) Key risks associated with the preferred approach

Reduction from three to two passes would impact on some households negatively, and attract opposition accordingly.

8. Recommendation

8.1 That the Executive endorse the principle of continuous improvement for RPS areas, and support the proposals 'in principle' as set out in 4.1 of the report.

Is this a key decision? Yes

Do the exempt information categories apply? No

Does Rule 15 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules (call-in and urgency) apply? No

How many appendices does the report contain? One

List of Background Papers: None

Lead Officer: Steve Bird, ADCSS
Telephone (01522) 873421