#### DENBIGHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

#### RECORD OF DECISION BY CABINET MEMBER

Decision taken by:

Lead Member for Sustainable Development and

the Environment

Date of decision:

21/12/04

Date of publication of decision:

05/01/05

**Decision:** To approve the policy for the introduction of residents parking schemes and charges.

Reason for seeking decision: The current policy with regard to the implementation of residents parking schemes was adopted in 1996. It requires such schemes to be self-funding and have the agreement of all the residents concerned. To date where schemes have been requested not all of the residents have supported the proposal. Decriminalisation of parking enforcement has given the Council the means of enforcing residents parking schemes and, as a result of more effective enforcement of parking restrictions, has resulted in an increase in requests for such schemes. The existing policy is considered to be too restrictive and fails to enable the Authority to meet requests that have majority support in an area.

It is suggested that a residents parking scheme should be considered for implementation in locations where at least 75% of car owning residents support it and it will be self funding. The level of charges and methods of operation of residents parking schemes are outlined in the attached paper.

The proposed policy and charges were reviewed by the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 25 November 2004 which resolved that they be recommended to the Lead Cabinet Member for Environment for adoption.

Interests declared:

None

**Consultation:** The proposals were the subject of consideration by the Environment Scrutiny Committee.

Powers:

Section 32 of Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Authority for delegation of the decision to the Cabinet Member: To determine the content of any plan, strategy or other policy document which relates solely to the Cabinet Member's portfolio. This does not include plans and strategies that form part of the policy framework as defined in article 4.2 of the Constitution.

# REPORT TO COUNCILLOR ERYL WILLIAMS, LEAD MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT

FROM:

HEAD OF

TRANSPORT

&

**INFRASTRUCTURE** 

DATE:

**17 DECEMBER 2004** 

SUBJECT:

**RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES** 

#### 1 DECISION SOUGHT

1.1 To approve the policy for the introduction of residents parking schemes and charges.

#### 2 REASON FOR SEEKING DECISION

The policy with regard to the implementation of residents 2.1 parking schemes was adopted by Technical Services Committee on 1 May 1996. The Committee resolved to grant approval to such schemes subject to them being self-funding and requiring the agreement of all the residents concerned. To date where schemes have been requested not all of the residents have supported the proposal nor have they been prepared to meet the establishment and running costs. One exception has been West Kinmel Street in Rhyl, where a scheme is in the process of being introduced. Following enforcement of a limited waiting restriction outside their houses by temporary traffic wardens the residents approached the Council to introduce a residents parking scheme. In this instance all of the residents replying to a survey indicated support for its introduction. It is considered appropriate at this time to review the policy regarding requests for residents parking schemes. The current policy requiring all residents to give their approval is considered to be too restrictive and fails to enable the Authority to meet requests that have majority support in an area. The take up of powers of decriminalised parking enforcement, and therefore more effective enforcement of existing parking restrictions, is expected to generate more requests. The employment of Parking Attendants will also provide the resource to enforce effectively parking schemes, whereas in

the past this would have fallen to the Police traffic warden service.

- 2.2 It is suggested that a residents parking scheme should be considered for implementation in locations where at least 75% of car owning residents support it and it will be self funding. It is intended that the charge for residents-only permits will reflect signing and legal costs spread over the number of car owning households in the residential area. Where possible the costs will be recouped within five years and no more than ten years. After ten years traffic signs would have to be replaced and therefore there is a strong likelihood of there being a net cost to the Authority. There will also be recurring annual costs connected with the issue of permits that will have to be covered.
- 2.3 The number of permits that residents in a household can purchase will be determined by the pressure on parking spaces. Where demand for parking by residents exceeds the available kerbspace it may be necessary to restrict the number of permits to one per household. Where there is no need for such a restriction it is proposed to charge the same for the first and any additional permits. This charging system would be no different from vehicle excise duty or insurance costs which are applied the same to any number of vehicles.
- 2.4 Where a residents parking scheme is introduced it will be necessary to allow for visitors to households in the controlled area. It is intended to allow residents to purchase one day permits for their visitors. The means of making these available has yet to be determined but will probably be by selling books containing ten one-day permits. The permits would be valid for a full financial year so that for a resident who had a visitor who parked in the area on ten days spread over a twelve month period one book of permits would satisfy their parking demands. It is suggested that the charge for a book of permits should be sufficient to meet the printing costs, this would approximate to one-fifth of the cost of a resident's permit.
- 2.5 It is proposed that certain categories of visitors should be allowed permits free of charge. These would be for medical or personal services, such as doctors, district nurses, home

- helps, meals on wheels and, in consultation with the Personal Services Directorate, carers.
- 2.6 It is recommended that businesses should not usually be able to purchase permits. Where a business is located in a residents only parking area, has no off-street parking and can demonstrate the need to load or unload directly to/from the premises, consideration will be given to issuing one permit at the same charge as a residents permit and subsequent permits at a cost of twice that of a resident's permits. An exception will be made for tourist accommodation the owners of which will be allowed to purchase visitor permits for their guests.
- 2.7 A final charge to be considered is for the replacement of lost, worn or damaged permits of any type. It is suggested that a nominal £5 charge be levied to cover administrative costs.
- 2.8 An example of the charges for the various permits is shown in the appendix.
- Where on-street charging in town centres may be considered 2.9 in the future, there could be locations where residents parking needs would have to be considered, such as those who live above shops and do not have off-street parking available. It would not be reasonable to expect residents to bear the full costs of introducing an on-street charging scheme. In these circumstances therefore it would be considered appropriate to relate the cost for an annual permit to the equivalent charge for an annual season ticket in the Council's long stay car parks with a small premium applied to encourage residents where possible to park in a nearby car park. Residents permit costs would be higher in town centre charging zones and therefore a one-fifth charge would be greater than the printing costs. However, to encourage visitors to use car parks, and avoid the potential for abuse by residents selling visitors parking permits to commuters, it is suggested that the one-fifth of residents permit costs formula also be applied. In town centre charging zones loading areas will be defined for vehicles servicing premises and therefore business permits will not be issued.

#### 3 POWER TO MAKE THE DECISION

3.1 Section 32 of Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

#### 4 COST IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The contents of this report will have no net cost implications. It is proposed that residents permit schemes be introduced only where all costs can be met from charges for permits.

#### 5 FINANCIAL CONTROLLER STATEMENT

5.1 It will be necessary to identify the cost of administering the service to ensure costs are recovered within the proposed charges. It is Council policy to review service charges regularly to ensure costs are adequately reflected within charges levied.

#### 6 CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT

- 6.1 The proposals contained within this report were reviewed by the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 25 November 2004 which resolved that they be recommended to the Lead Cabinet Member for Environment for adoption.
- 6.2 It is intended to carry out detailed consultation with local Members and residents/businesses when considering the introduction of any residents parking scheme.

## 7 IMPLICATIONS ON OTHER POLICY AREAS INCLUDING CORPORATE

7.1 No significant impact on other policy areas.

#### 8 RECOMMENDATION

To approve the policy for the introduction of residents parking schemes and charges outlined in the report.

#### **APPENDIX**

### Examples of typical permit charges for a residents parking area

£5
£5
al charge
£5
where