

15 March 2018

To: All Members of the Cabinet Member Signing

Dear Member,

Cabinet Member Signing - Friday, 16th March, 2018

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

- 4. THE REVIEW OF PARKING PERMIT POLICY AND CHARGES - RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION. (PAGES 1 - 8)**

Yours sincerely

Susan John
Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

This page is intentionally left blank

LATE BUSINESS SHEET

THE ADMISSION OF ANY LATE ITEMS OF BUSINESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 100B OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AND IN AGREEMENT WITH CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE THAT THERE ARE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTRANCE THAT REQUIRE THE REPORT BEING CONSIDERED

Report Title: The Review of Parking Permit Policy and Charges – Results of Statutory Consultation.

Committee/Sub etc: Single Member signing

Date: 16/03/18

Reason for lateness and reason for consideration before the next ordinary meeting of the Committee.

To consider responses received after the initial consultation period had ended and to ensure a minimum 21-day consultation period is observed.

Although there is no requirement to individually consult residents on permit price changes, the Council decided to go beyond current requirements, and send an e-mail to registered resident permit holders. Unfortunately, due to the sheer number of e-mails being sent, some were not sent at the start of the consultation period.

It was therefore agreed - in consultation with legal services - that although the consultation period was due to close on 23rd February, responses would be accepted until 13th March and considered by the Cabinet Member within an addendum to the main report.

This addendum sets out the additional consultation responses received up until 13th March.

This page is intentionally left blank

Addendum

Although the consultation period was due to close on 23rd February, responses have been accepted until 13th March. The responses below in black (text brackets) were received between 2nd February and 5th March. The responses in red (text brackets) were received between 6th and 13th March.

In summary the Council received 715 responses to proposals. The principle feedback received falls into eleven main categories:

Objection 1 - restructuring of visitor permits and removal of the 2-hour permit is unfair (money making scheme) as is the price increase for the 1-hour permit / unfair to residents in all day and event day CPZ's (151 responses) (6 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

There is a need to rationalise the visitor permit offer, ensuring that residents can receive visitors, but within the spirit of our overarching transport policies and strategies. The current offer significantly exceeds that offered in other London Boroughs, increasing administration costs, with very low uptake of some permits.

Hourly visitor vouchers can be used consecutively, if parking is required beyond one hour. With the removal of the upper limit on the number that can be purchased, removing the 2 hourly voucher has very little impact. The charge proposed for the hourly permit is now more reflective of that charged in other London boroughs and very reasonable when compared with the on-street short stay parking charges. Concessionary charges are retained for those registered disabled or aged 65 years or over. It should be noted that purchased 2 hr permits may continue to be used until their expiry date.

Those residing in all day and Event CPZs benefit from the protection that this offers, in terms of prioritising parking facilities for them and their visitors through the presence of Civil Enforcement Officers throughout those hours. It also reduces parking stress, keeping the streets safe during the operational hours.

Objection 2 - that increases are extortionate and unjustified (120 responses) (12 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

The changes proposed will support the delivery of the Council's agreed Transport Strategy and will encourage the use of more fuel efficient vehicles, help manage demand for parking space, reducing short trips, encouraging walking and cycling and the use of public transport.

The Council has not reviewed parking permit charging structures for several years. The new banding structure is intended to encourage ownership of less polluting vehicles. We are aligning the Council's CO₂ charge bands with the widely known DVLA CO₂ vehicle tax emissions bandings. It should be noted that many residents

will have their permit charges reduced, others will find little or no change and those owning higher emission vehicles will pay more. The increase in parking charges is proportionate to the aim of covering the administration and enforcement costs of CPZs and is in line with parking charges in other boroughs. In addition, through the Transport Strategy Action Plans, all residents will be encouraged to take advantage of more sustainable travel options including car clubs, car sharing and better public transport. The introduction of a six monthly permit will also help those, who for economic reasons would prefer not to purchase an annual permit.

Objection 3 – removing limits on visitor permit numbers will undermine effectiveness of CPZ’s (103 responses) (1 additional response between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

With the proposed removal of the 2 hour and weekend visitor permit, it may be difficult for residents to know how many hourly or daily visitor permits they will need. Therefore, we have proposed to remove the upper limit on the numbers of visitor permits that may be purchased. There are concerns that removing the upper limit may result in visitor permits being sold on to commuters, but we will closely monitor the use of those permits and if fraudulent use becomes evident, we will then consider re-introducing an upper limit.

Objection 4 - It is unfair that visitor permits will expire at the end of calendar year (101 responses) (1 additional response between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

At present the Visitors Vouchers contain expiry dates, which were originally intended as a means of stock control. This means that many of those permits may be valid for up to five years. Due to the relatively low cost many residents purchase large numbers of permits. Many fail to use them during the period in which they were valid, and then seek to obtain a refund when not used; resulting in additional administrative and financial costs to the Council.

However, having considered the feedback during the consultation and the likely development of an Electronic Visitor permit offer in the future, it is recommended that visitor vouchers continue within existing lifetimes.

Objection 5 - charges unfair to residents including those who need carers (38 responses) (2 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

The changes proposed will support the delivery of the Council's agreed Transport Strategy and will encourage the use of more fuel efficient vehicles, and help manage demand for parking space, reducing short trips and encouraging walking and cycling and the use of public transport.

There are a number of options available to carers, and this includes permits (carers) charged at the same level as residential permits. Hourly and Daily permits may be used and removing the upper limit on numbers that may be purchased will help residents who chose this option. While the cost of the hourly permit is increasing, it still represents very good value, especially when compared to other London boroughs.

Objection 6 - Inadequate information and consultation / lack of time to consider changes (30 responses) (6 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

Under the current regulations, the Council is not required to consult on permit increases and may apply these by undertaking a Statutory Notification. We have therefore chosen to carry out a wider consultation than we are required to do so by law.

The consultation included:

Details of the proposals published in local newspapers, the London Gazette and on the Council's website.

Notices advising of the consultation and details of where to obtain further information placed in prominent places throughout the borough.

In addition, where possible we contacted permit holders individually by email alerting them to changes proposed.

Although there is no requirement to individually consult residents on permit price changes, the Council decided to go beyond current requirements, and send an e-mail to registered residents permit holders. Unfortunately, due to the sheer number of e-mails being sent, some were not sent at the start of the consultation period. However, although the consultation period was due to close on 23rd February, responses will be accepted until 13th March and considered by the Cabinet Member within an addendum to the main report.

Objection 7 - adverse impact on traders, carers and other services for residents (17 responses) (4 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

Proposals are not restricting access to parking permits, but ensuring that arrangements support the delivery of our wider transport policies. We aim to introduce a more affordable six monthly permit. The proposed 'permission to park' allows instant access to parking, and removal of the upper limit on the numbers of visitors permits that can be purchased, should help remove any barriers that currently exist.

Objection 8 - unfair to raise age bar (11 responses) (2 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

The qualifying age for age at which residents can access the concessionary scheme was set over 20 years ago, when 60 years of age was accepted as the average retirement age. The concession was intended for those of retirement age and those registered disabled. Requiring people aged 60 - 65 to pay full parking charges in line with other people of working age is proportionate to the aim of covering the administration and enforcement costs of CPZs, while continuing to provide concessionary rates to more vulnerable residents in the borough. In addition, through the Transport Strategy Action Plans, all residents will be encouraged to take advantage of more sustainable travel options including car clubs, car sharing and better public transport.

Objection 9 - Permit charges should be based on vehicle use rather than on engine size or other criteria (6 responses) (0 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

This is not a developed charging solution and as such would be extremely difficult to administer. In addition, such a charging system would also have limited value in encouraging the switch to and use of low-polluting vehicles.

Objection 10 - Changes to emissions banding do not go far enough and do not discourage car use – especially diesel vehicles (2 responses) (0 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

The Council through its policies and charging structures (parking), encourage CO₂ reduction. The proposals under consultation are in line with those policies. The Council is mindful of all air pollutants from diesel vehicles and has commissioned

the development of a charging model that takes account of them all. This will feed into any future parking charge review.

Objection 11 - other permit related comments (96 responses) (6 additional responses between 6th and 13th March)

Council response

Not specific to this consultation and or contained / responded to within Objections 1-10 above.

This page is intentionally left blank