

Report Title. Review of pay & display charges – feedback to statutory notification of proposals to increase charges.

Report of :Niall Bolger , Director of Urban Environment

Signed : *NP Bolger* . *9th March 2011*

Contact Officer : Ann Cunningham, Head of Parking Services

Contact number; 0208 489 1355

Wards(s) affected: All

Report for: Cabinet

1. Purpose of the report (That is, the decision required)

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the feedback to statutory notification of the Councils intention to increase pay & display charges and the outcome of the additional assessment of the likely impact on town centres.

1.2 This reports sets out officers response to this feedback (objections) for Members to consider, before making a decision to proceed to give statutory notification of the increase in charges for pay & display parking.

2. Introduction by Cabinet Member (if necessary)

2.1 The Cabinet agreed the proposed increase in parking fees and charges on 16 November 2011 and authorised officers to proceed to statutory notification on proposals. This report details feedback to the notification of the charge increase and the outcome of the additional work undertaken to asses the likely impact of increases on local town centres.

2.2 Proposals are in line with existing policy that sets parking charges at a level that discourages long stay parking and achieves the turnover of parking spaces that is needed in our town centres.

3. State Links with Council Plan Priorities and actions and/ or other strategies

3.1 The review of parking fees and charges supports Council priority 1 – A cleaner, Greener Haringey by managing the borough road network to improve user compliance, ease traffic flow and keep our roads safer.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Members are asked that after duly considering the feedback to proposals to increase parking charges (pay & display) to;

a) implement the proposed increase to pay & display charges are detailed in this report.

b) move charges to the higher band in the town centres of:

- Crouch End,
- Muswell Hill
- Green Lanes

5. Summary

5.1 On 16 November 2010 the Cabinet agreed the proposed increase in parking fees and charges and authorised officers to proceed to statutory notification on proposals. The subsequent report to Cabinet on 13 December 2010 (the response to the resolution of the overview and scrutiny committee) agreed that additional work would be undertaken on the likely impact of the proposed increase in pay & display charges on town centres, in particular Crouch End, Muswell Hill and Green Lanes where proposals include a move to the higher charge band.

5.2 Pay & display charges are intended to be set at a level that discourages long stay parking and achieves a high turnover of parking spaces. The proposed increase are linked to our policy of using the charging regime to help manage demand and ensure an adequate supply of parking spaces, especially in our busier town centres.

5.3 The charging policy implemented in 2009 linked charges to occupancy levels, introducing the mechanism for charging to influence parking patterns by increasing or decreasing charges if necessary.

5.4 This did not result in an overall increase in charges, but involved a small increase in some areas, taking steps to address the inequality where pay & display charges were in general much higher in the eastern part of the borough than in the west (despite western areas experiencing similar if not higher levels of usage). Further adjustments need to be made in Crouch End, Muswell Hill and Green Lanes where charges should move to the higher band.

5.5 Despite increasing parking provision (with further works are planned for Green Lanes) the ongoing biggest concern raised about parking is the availability of parking spaces. There is limited scope to further increase the number / level of parking spaces in our busier town centres (apart from what is being considered in Green Lanes), due to limited kerb space and as consequence there is an increasing need to manage turnover to meet demand.

5.2 When reviewing our charges consideration was given to;

- The Council's transport and wider policy objectives
- Statutory or legal requirements that may effect the setting of fees
- car ownership patterns
- the increasing demand for parking

- traffic management issues
- Market conditions – (parking charges in other boroughs)
- cost of delivering the service
- Impact of charges on relevant stakeholders

6.0 Statutory Notification process

6.1 By virtue of s46A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 there is no requirement under statute to consult on the proposals to increase pay & display parking charges, and the Council need only give 21 days notice that they intend to do so. The Council concluded that in this case public notices calling for informal comments were appropriate.

6.2 In addition questionnaires were designed to gather additional information on parking and travel matters that would help us further assess the likely impact of proposals on town centres.

6.3 The majority of feedback to the Public Notices was in relation to proposed permit charges increases, which is addressed in a separate report.

6.4 Feedback is divided into three sections

- a) Analysis of the feedback received in response to the public notices
- b) Highlighting a summary of the key objections received together with the Council's considered response. Each objection with the appropriate response is considered in turn.
- c) Highlighting responses from statutory bodies, objections received from local residents associations with the Council's considered response and noting the petitions that have been forwarded as part of the consultation.
- d) Analysis of the feedback to questionnaires

7.0 Analysis

Public Notices

7.1 Public Notices were placed in all roads affected by proposals inviting informal feedback from residents, businesses and other stakeholders. Details were also published in local newspapers and on the Council's website. In addition 750 questionnaires were distributed to Businesses across the borough and 1000 questionnaires seeking feedback from users were placed on vehicles parked in pay & display bays across the borough, but with particular attention paid to Crouch End, Muswell Hill and Green Lanes.

7.2 The detailed feedback to the Public Notices is available in appendix 1 to this report. Most of this feedback relates to the proposed increase in permit charges, and the issues arising are addressed in a separate report. However, we have included the full analysis in this report for completeness. In summary the Council received 82 responses to the Public Notice. The source of those responses are as follows;

- 65 responses from residents
- 4 public/ residents associations
- 4 from Traders associations raising objections in relation to pay & display proposals
- 3 lobby/ campaign

7.3 The principle feedback to the statutory notification of proposals to increase pay & display

charges were

Objection 1 - High charges would damage local trade

Council response

The Council's position is that we aim to set charges at a level that encourages a turnover of parking spaces which is especially beneficial for short stay visits by shoppers and visitors. The charging policy implemented in 2009 using a basic traffic management principle, uses charging as a mechanism to manage demand by increasing or decreasing charges if necessary to influence parking patterns.

Independent research (including that by *Sustrans liveable neighbourhoods*) suggest that retailers overestimate the importance of car-borne trade and that retail vitality would be better served by traffic restraint, public transport improvements and a range of measures to improve the walking environment.

8.0 Views from statutory bodies, resident associations, other interested bodies and information on petitions received

8.1 The Muswell Hill Traders Group, Crouch End Traders Assoc and Harringay Green Lanes Traders Assoc, representing over 500 local businesses stated that the feedback that they received from all the members of the groups is a united voice of disenchantment to the proposed 110% rise in parking charges.

All the Trader groups are in support to the 35% rise within the Mid Band taking the current £1.40 per hour to £1.90, which they all considered fair and reasonable in the face of cutbacks by sharing the burden, however all the Trader groups strongly object to being moved onto the High Band in line with Wood Green.

Wood Green has benefited from large investment spending on streetscape in previous years and now attracts a large footfall, making it the Borough's prime High street 'showcase'. Wood Green is considered a major North London shopping centre, with large branded shops, good transport links and NCP car parks. Wood Green are in competition with other centres like Brent Cross Shopping and Enfield Town Centre. We on the other hand are just local shops, not so unique that shoppers won't go elsewhere which will be devastating to our High street and small businesses.

All the Trader groups would strongly urge the Council to reconsider and take into the account the impact it will cause to business, employment and the sustainability of local shopping centres. We would welcome further dialogue and if necessary meet to discuss our shared concerns

Council response

The Council's position is that we aim to set charges at a level that encourages a turnover of parking spaces which is especially beneficial for short stay visits by shoppers and visitors. While improvements have been made in parking provision in Muswell Hill, and Crouch End (with further work underway in Green Lanes) the main concern still raised in relation to parking is the availability of parking spaces. With limited kerb space and as such limited capacity to further increase parking provision the only means of meeting demand is by managing turnover. Charging plays a key role in managing this.

8.2 Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association *objects strongly to the 114% increase in stop and*

shop parking charges in Muswell Hill on top of the rises that were implemented in 2009. We feel that this is a totally unreasonable increase. We have no objections to the principle of charging for parking but ask that the present proposals be reconsidered as it will have the effect of putting yet more pressure on already heavily congested local streets and ultimately driving shoppers away from Muswell Hill.

Council response

The increase to pay & display charges are intended to manage the turnover of kerb space and ensure an adequate supply of parking spaces especially in our busier town centres. It is also our aim that charging levels are linked to traffic management issues and we can demonstrate a consistent approach to charging across the borough. This does not mean that charges should be set at the same level across the borough, but in line with the adopted policy linked to occupancy levels, which is a basic traffic management principle.

A sample analysis of parking patterns in local streets in Muswell Hill would suggest that there is little capacity for any additional displacement as motorists choosing to avoid paying parking fees are already doing so and parking in the unrestricted streets.

The new charging policy adopted in 2008 and implemented in 2009 did not involve an overall increase in charges, but took some steps in addressing the inequality that applied where pay & display charges were in general much higher in the eastern parts of the borough than in the west, where there were similar if not higher levels of demand for those facilities. As a consequence this resulted in a small increase in some parts of the borough.

Concerns raised by Businesses at that time were the same in that any increase in parking charges would result in shoppers going elsewhere. There was no impact on pay & display use and indeed there is evidence of increased usage in some areas.

Further adjustments are now required in Crouch End, Muswell Hill and Green Lanes and it is appropriate that those areas should move to the higher charge band. Should that move significantly change parking patterns and result in much reduced usage, the charging policy has the mechanism to address this.

8.3 *We are a small specialist jewellery shop that does not and cannot rely on the local walk to shop catchment area. We are or rather were a destination shop for a large area outside of the local community ie Essex Hertfordshire and even South London.*

Gradually the over-zealous enforcement of parking controls by traffic wardens, even when there was no traffic congestion, threatened the viability of specialist shops against the free parking offered by out of town superstores / shopping malls and paid for parking with no time limitation in central London.

The council has continued with the enforcement and restriction of parking for this area therefore discouraging any outside traffic in to Muswell Hill.

Please spend your time as the responsible authority in trying to encourage the success of the Muswell Hill retail scene enabling the shops to continue to pay the rates by encouraging visitors to the shopping area.

Please be realistic. You have already discouraged many people from visiting this area and any increases at this time can only be negative therefore any increase must be minimal.

Council response

Those issues have been answered in the Councils response to the objections as addressed above. Further specific comments are as follows;

- Parking and traffic management arrangements are a feature of towns centres even in areas outside of London. Haringey is busy London Borough and has significantly improved parking arrangements in Muswell Hill in recent years. The recent review further extended parking provision. Enforcement is essential in managing those arrangements and the Council ensures that this is carried out in a fair, proportionate and transparent manner.

8.4 I ask, as a local shop keeper in Muswell Hill, that parking charges are not increased so much that it will discourage shoppers coming here. There are many small independent business in this area who are struggling as it is. Please do not drive our customers to Brent Cross where you can park for free. Muswell Hill is a unique and well supported shopping area and it needs to stay that way.

Council response

Those issues have been answered in the Councils response to the objections as addressed above. Further specific comments are

- it is very likely that individuals who currently shop in Muswell also visit other larger Shopping Centres, such as Brent Cross at present and that those large shopping centres are unlikely to replace the convenience of shopping locally.

8.5 We write on behalf of the Haringay Green Lanes Traders Association, representing nearly 200 shops along Green Lanes. We have now received extensive and comprehensive feedback from our shop-to-shop canvass with shop owners and members of the general public. We strongly urge the Council to re-considered Haringay Green Lanes to remain in the Mid band for parking charges. Below are the main points we would like to make concerning the impact this will have on Green Lanes high street:

1. *Small businesses are disadvantaged by the larger companies. Every Sainsburys, Tescos, B&Q, Homebase etc has their own car parking facilities, whilst the high street business rely on the limited Council controlled parking bays. By increasing this cost, you are effectively supporting the larger companies than the local shops. This will have a huge adverse impact to local high street.*
2. *At a time of rising costs in fuel, business rates, VAT, and national insurance, a 114% rise in parking charge seem unbelievable, unfair and unjust.*
3. *Green Lanes is not like Crouch end or Muswell Hill. A simple breakfast with coffee at Café Lemon is just under £5, whereas a similar meal in Muswell Hill is nearly £10. The demographics of Green Lanes shoppers are much more akin to Tottenham than Muswell Hill.*
4. *Existing customers can find alternative shopping centres like Tottenham High Road and Angel Edmonton (Fore Street) for the Turkish/Kurdish food groceries and restaurants, and Arena Shopping park where parking is completely free. The Arena management has put up signs - that their carpark is only available to Arena shoppers.*
5. *We note that Muswell Hill and Crouch end do have alternative parking facilities on adjoining roads, whereas Green Lanes is completely surrounded by all day CPZ.*
6. *This scheme is unfriendly to the Retail trade and will drive away retail businesses and instead attract more restaurants and takeaways because parking becomes free after 7pm, and no CPZ after 6.30pm.*
7. *Wood Green should have a banding on their own, rather than the rest of the town-centres joining them. Wood Green is a major north London shopping centre with large household*

named shops and with well equipped NPC car parks and transport links. We feel that this increase not only damage local trade, but could also reduce Council income when the shoppers are scared away. We fully support the increase to parking charges in the Mid band. But we object to being moved to the Higher band like Wood Green when we are NOT like Wood Green. We would welcome any feedback or facilitate any meeting concerning this.

Council response

Those issues have been answered in the Councils response to the objections as addressed above.

8.6 *I write on behalf of Crouch End Traders and Crouch End Project. Crouch End is as you know a vibrant shopping area with approximately 210 retail units in total. Comprising from one person shops to the supermarkets of Budgen's, M & S and Waitrose.*

We only have one very small car park situated behind Budgen's and the Library Car Park which is available temporarily with about half a dozen spaces. This means that parking in Crouch End is under considerable pressure. This means that small businesses in Crouch End like other town centres have to work even harder to attract their customers so we do not lose out to the supermarkets with their own large car parks which are free at point of use.

Crouch End has a diverse mixture of shops from fashion and to fresh food indeed Crouch End still has butchers, bakers, greengrocers and a fishmonger – quite rare in today's high streets offering great value offers which means customers use their cars to take advantage of this. In addition Crouch End also has a thriving cafe society and restaurants, many of which are open through the day and evening.

At a time when we are seeing increase costs to both business and individuals (such as National Insurance contributions, VAT fuel) increasing the parking charges by more than double seems unjust and unfair and could have a adverse effect on customer flow and ultimately in employment in the retail sector. Businesses in Crouch End are well aware that our customers can make other choices and easily shop at centres such as Haringey Arena, Tesco Friern Barnet and Friern Barnet Retail Park.

In Conclusion, I would urge the council to retain Crouch End in the medium charge zone and not rebrand Crouch End to the high charge band. We accept the need for a moderate increase particularly in the current financial climate but urge the council not to put crouch end in the high charge band thereby more then doubling current charges. Such an increase we fear could have a detrimental effect on the viability of the retail sector and subsequently employment.

Council response

Our survey of visitors indicates that the availability of parking spaces in their biggest concern. We have reviewed the parking arrangements and increased the amount of parking provided. There is little scope for any further increase (due to limited kerb space) and with the high level of usage in Crouch End it is appropriate to move those charge to the high band.

Petitions

The Council received two petitions, the basis of the objection and the number of signatories are summarised below;

a) Haringey Traders association have lodged a petition with 155 shop owners' and 830 shoppers signatures against proposals to increase the hourly rate of pay & display from £1.40 to £3.00 per hour.

B) Tottenham / West Green Rd residents and businesses with 75 signatures (17 addresses given are outside of Haringey).

We the undersigned strongly object to Haringey council's above mentioned aggressive and discriminatory policies towards businesses and residents of Haringey. The above increases adversely affect small businesses ability to compete with bigger businesses that provide free parking. Net affect drives customers out of our already struggling high streets. Residents are being pushed to the brink with increasing petrol costs (taxes that the government collects) let alone increasing permit charges.

Questionnaires

9.0 Analysis of response to questionnaires is detailed below and additional information is provided on mode split to Haringey town centres to put some context on this feedback and analysis.

9.1 Mode split to Haringey town centres

The analysis below is from the GLA Town Centre Health Check report, 2009 and gives a broad indication of how our town centres are accessed and in particular gives an indication of the level of visits by private cars.

Centre	% of weekday trips to town centre			
	Public transport	Private transport	Cycle	Walking
Wood Green	43.3	11.3	0.5	44.9
Crouch End	18.8	23.5	10.9	46.8
Green Lanes	39.4	33.0	0.0	27.6
Muswell Hill	12.4	40.5	0.0	47.1
Tottenham	34.1	26.4	0.0	39.5
West Green Road	20.0	19.0	0.0	61.0

Note: The data is from London Travel Demand Survey [September 2005- March 2008]. The data is for trips with either an origin or destination or wholly within the town centre

9.2 The detailed feedback to the questionnaires is available in Appendix Two. A total of 750 questionnaires were distributed to businesses across the borough. A further 1000 were placed on vehicles parked in pay & display bays across the borough over a period of three weeks ensuring that our target audience was reached. The Council received a total of 204 responses; of those 120 were returned by businesses and 84 from individual motorists. The summary of responses are detailed below;

9.3 When asked how frequently those visitors visit those town centres

- 41% reported most days. This % was higher in Green Lanes at 54%.
- 36% reported weekly. This % was lower in Green Lanes at 15%
-

9.4 When asked how long it took those visitors to drive to those town centres

- 54% reported that it took less than 15 minutes
- 32% reported that it took 15-30 minutes. This % was much higher in Green Lanes at 50%
- 14% reported that it longer than 30 minutes.

This would suggest that the majority of people visiting out town centres are local people.

9.5 When asked how long it took to find a parking space

- 27% reported that they found a place immediately
- 25% reported that they found a place within 2-5 minutes
- 25% reported that they found a place within 15-30 minutes. This % was higher in Green Lanes at 50%
- 16% reported that it took longer than 15 minutes

9.6 When Businesses were asked what their customers say about parking;

- 63% reported that their customers complain mostly about the difficulty in finding an available parking space ,
- 43% reported that customers complain that there are not enough spaces close to all shops and restaurants
- 24% reported that customers complain about the level of charges; however this % was much higher Green Lanes at 41%.
- 23% reported that customers complain about the clarity of parking restriction signage ,

9.7 When visitors were asked what the most important aspect of parking was;

- 63% felt that the ability to quickly find a parking space was most important
- 46% felt that parking charges were most important, however this % was disproportionately higher in Green lanes at 62% and Tottenham and Seven Sisters at 54%
- 34% felt that clear and simple signage was most important

Both businesses and pay & display users rate the ability to find a parking space much higher than the level of parking charges.

9.8 When Businesses were asked how long their customers generally want to park for;

- 35% reported that customers needed to park for two hours or more, this % was much higher in Crouch End (47%) Muswell Hill (50%) Wood Green (56%). In Green Lanes only 28% felt that customers needed to park for two hours or more, with 41% stating about one hour.

9.9 When visitors were asked how long they generally want to park for;

- 46% reported that they needed to park for one to two hours. The % was higher in Crouch End (67%), Green Lanes (50%) Muswell Hill (54%).

9.10 When Businesses were asked what impact an increase in parking charges would have on the customers;

- 60% reported that they might make fewer visits to our town centres
- 14% reported that they might park for a shorter time when visiting
- 74% reported that customers would go to another town centre or shopping mall
- 9% reported that they might use public transport or other alternatives
- 6% reported that it would not have a significant impact

9.11 When visitors were asked what impact an increase in parking charges would have on them;

- 71% reported that they would make fewer visits
- 15% reported that they might use public transport. However this % was significantly higher in Tottenham & Seven Sisters at (31%)
- 8% reported that would park for a shorter length of time
- 5% reported that it would not have a significant impact

9.12 When visitors were asked why they decided to travel by car;

- 44% reported that car was more convenient
- 41% reported that public transport was not practical because of need to carry heavy shopping
- 7% reported that public transport was not practical due to having a physical disability
- 4% reported that public transport links were poor
- 4% reported that it worked out cheaper to use the car

10.0 Conclusions

10.1 The feedback from public notices and questionnaires does not support an increase in charges. This is not unexpected as increases to parking fees and charges generally prove very unpopular, with a significant level of objection from businesses, residents and other stakeholders. However in reality any increase in charge implemented has not resulted in a reduction in overall uptake or use of those facilities.

10.2 From a traffic management perspective this snap shot of views from businesses and visitors (car users) would suggest that;

- The biggest concern of motorists is the availability of parking spaces
- The majority of people visiting our town centres (by car) are local to that area and visit on a regular basis and are likely to continue to do so.
- The majority of visitors report that an increase in charges may result in them making fewer visits to town centres. Others say that they may use public transport. (They do not say that they will go elsewhere and that they will overall spend less in those town centres). This could have a positive impact with a shift to more sustainable modes of transport and could also open up parking spaces for those needing them.
- Car use is more convenient and as such the charge increase is unlikely to deter the majority of motorists using their cars.
- Traders and businesses may as a consequence benefit more from passing trade if more spaces are opened up.
- While businesses take the view that increased charges will drive customers away to other shopping centres, the reality of feedback from visitors is that charges are not their biggest concern.
- The increase in charges will deter the 'commuter' parking that exists among businesses and their employees and other motorists who abuse the low charging regime, freeing up additional spaces for shoppers¹.

¹(information gathered from a previous survey)

10.3 Research was undertaken on parking charges and town centre arrangements in other boroughs. The majority of boroughs were either reviewing their charges or had the intention of doing so. In general there was a common view that charges should influence parking patterns. Actual comparison of charges and town centre arrangements proved difficult (due to time constraints) as some areas were much better served by car parks which took pressure off the public highway and gave a much wider choice in parking arrangements.

10.4 Independent research ¹ found that while many traders would like to see lower parking charges, research has shown that there is little or no correlation between parking charges and economic vitality of a centre. Several cities in Europe have tried to introduce an initial free period of parking (such as 30 minutes) to encourage retailing but evidence indicates this has no impact on economic activity but adds to congestion while cars hunt for a free parking space. Generally it is the range and quality of the retail or leisure available that is most important. Improving the quality of the retail offer and public realm will provide far better returns than spending money on subsidising car parking. This view was generally shared by boroughs that had very low charges or offered an initial period of free parking.

¹ Parking Review Issue 204 March 2009

10.5 However if a decision is made to implement those charges, parking patterns must be closely monitored and appropriate action taken if a different pattern of usage emerges

10.6 The legal implications arising from proposals are summarised in paragraph 10 of this report.

10.0 Head of Legal Services Comments

10.1 The Council has power under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to set and review charges for parking in its area. In doing so it has to have regard to the objectives of the Act "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway". The procedure for amending the charges is set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and, as noted in paragraph 6.1, it does not include a statutory obligation to consult. The proposals in this report are in accordance with these regulations.

10.2 It is also noted that Members must have regard to the Council's obligations under equalities legislation, and that an Equalities Impact Assessment was carried out as a result of the Overview and Scrutiny decision of 8 December 2010 to assist in this regard. Members must have regard to these obligations and the EQIA in taking a decision on this proposal. If Members consider that the proposals could have an adverse impact on equality, they should consider whether the adverse impact could be reduced by taking particular measures.

11.0 Equalities & Community Cohesion implications

11.1 A further assessment has been carried out which considered the likely equalities and economic impact of the proposed charge increase and the report is attached as appendix 4

12.0 Equalities & Community Cohesion Comments

12.0 A full Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out on the increase to parking charges. Equalities monitoring data is not available for users of pay & display bays as shoppers and visitors as they come from areas within the borough and elsewhere.

12.1 The key findings are that ;
The charge increase may reduce barriers as follows ;

- An increase in parking turnover will be especially beneficial for short stay visits by shoppers or visitors.
- Blue badge holders will benefit from easier access to convenient parking locations.
- Businesses and traders will benefit from easier access for some of their customers / shoppers.
- Increased take up of public transport or more people walking or cycling to town centres. Potentially increase trade in town centres from passing trade (those driving through as opposed to specifically visiting the area).
- The community in general will continue to benefit from the proportion of parking revenues spent on highways maintenance or concessionary travel.

12.2 The charge increase may increase barriers as follows;

- A potential impact on low income households as most CPZ coverage is in the central or eastern parts of the boroughs where household income tends to be lower.
- The potential risk that visitors to our town centres will change their shopping patterns and thus reduce local shopping choice.

12.3 Proposals will have little or no change on Residents (and visitors) with long term physical disabilities who are the target group most reliant on parking provision and concessions for access purposes.

11.0 Consultation

11.1 By virtue of s46A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 there is no requirement under statute to consult on the proposals to increase the cost of parking permits, and the Council need only give 21 days notice that they intend to do so. The Councils considered view was that in this case Public Notices calling for informal comments was the most appropriate way to proceed with proposals.

12.0 Service Financial Comments

12.1 There are significant underlying budget pressures in Haringey's Parking Account. Throughout 2010/ 11 a range of short term and long term measures were introduced to address these underlying budget pressures. The additional income expected from this charge review address this shortfall and any revenues generated above operational costs will be used as permitted on transport related service such as highways maintenance and improvements and concessionary travel.

12.2 The financial estimates in relation to the proposed increase in permit charges are based on the assumption that the number of permits issued annually remains relatively constant within each CPZ.

13.0 Chief Finance Officer Comments

13.1 The draft budget for 2010-11 agreed by Cabinet on 8th February assumes that the fees and charges changes outlined in this report will both address the base budget shortfall within Parking, approximately £400,000 and contribute £1,000,000 to the savings required to set a balanced budget for 2011-12. Of this total around £600k is expected to be achieved due to the changes in banding.

If the changes are not agreed then alternative savings will need to be identified in order to set a balanced budget for 2011-12.

14.0 Use of appendices /Tables and photographs

Appendix 1 _ Detailed analysis of feedback to statutory notification of proposals to increase parking charges

Appendix 2- petitions received

Appendix 3- Detailed analysis of the feedback to questionnaires designed to further assess the likely impact of increased charges on town centres.

Appendix 4- EQIA

Appendix 5 – Proposed parking charges and charges in other boroughs.

15.0 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Road Traffic Act 1984

Part 6 of TMA 2004

Statutory and Operational guidance on Part 6 of TMA 2004

Parking charges and town centre arrangements in other Boroughs

Reports to Cabinet on review of parking charges 16 November 2010

Response to Overview and Scrutiny Call-in 8 December 2010

Report to Cabinet 13 December 2010 – response to the resolution of Overview and Scrutiny

Appendix 5 –

Proposed increase to Pay & display

	Low	Medium	High
Existing charges	£1.00	£1.40	£2.40
Proposals	£1.20	£1.90	£3.00

Pay & Display charges in other boroughs

Borough	Hourly P&D rates
Camden	£1.60 to £4.90
Islington	£2 - £4.80 (£5.60 but not in use)
Lambeth	£2.10 - £4.20
Hackney	£2.20 to £4.00
Enfield	£1 (under review to £1.50)
Newham	£2 - £3

When this research was undertaken the majority of boroughs were either reviewing their charges or had the intention of doing so. In general there was a common view that charges should influence parking patterns. Actual comparison of charges and town centre arrangements proved difficult as some areas were much better served by car parks which took pressure off the public highway and gave a much wider choice to shoppers in terms of parking arrangements.