

Scrutiny Topic Scoping Report – Review of Residents’ Parking Scheme

Summary

1. This report seeks to define the scope of this work based on preliminary work by the informal Task Group from this committee in regard to the proposal made by Cllr D’Agorne to review CYC’s Residents’ Priority Parking Scheme – see copy of topic registration form at Annex A.
2. Members are asked to consider the work done by the Task Group so far and agree the scope of this work and assess the impacts on this topic, and agree how best to progress this policy development review proposal to the next stage.

Background

3. The residents' priority parking scheme (ResPark) restricts parking within designated areas of York, known as 'ResPark zones', to those people who are eligible to apply for a permit. The scheme gives priority to park within a particular zone to residents and property owners.
4. Permits are available for residents within the ResPark zones and their visitors:
 - Household permits (and additional permits)
 - Visitor parking permits
 - Special control parking permits
 - House in multiple occupancy parking permits
5. Permits are also available for people who may own properties within a zone, or have a commercial requirement for parking there, for example:
 - Guest house parking permits
 - Property parking permits

- Landlord and management agents permits
 - Business parking permits
 - Commercial parking permits
 - Community parking permits
6. Vehicles without a permit are only able to park or wait in a zone for the advised permitted waiting time (usually 10 minutes). The ResPark scheme does not guarantee a space, but gives priority over other vehicles who do not qualify to park within a ResPark zone. Most ResPark permits are only valid within one designated zone (usually the zone containing the applicant's home address or business), and a separate permit is required for each vehicle, with the exception of motorcycles and bicycles.

Analysis

7. The significant number and small size of the resident parking zones increases complexity. These have been implemented over many years since the early 1980's where between then and up to 2003 we had 29 zones across the city. Since then it has raised to 61 with more being implemented and more waiting to be reviewed all of which are instigated by residents and/or Ward Councillors.
8. Cllr D'Agorne, who has instigated this review, has sent officers some of his findings which include a small sample that compares York's annual first household permits to other towns and cities first permits, although this information is several years out of date, any analysis will need to compare like with like.
9. Cost savings and customer service improvements are continually reviewed by Parking Services. One example includes the project to replace the IT systems which will improve the online self-service system for customers.
10. In line with some of the committee members' comments about digital/virtual parking permits, this is included as options for future developments once the IT system is in place.

Efficiency/Complexity

11. The cost of running a resident parking scheme is complex and is linked to the fact that York has chosen to implement very small, often single

street, res park schemes which means each one is disproportionately expensive to implement and we are increasingly seeing the piecemeal spread of these zones. York has 61 zones (increasing every year) compared to say Harrogate's number of zones, which are in single figures as an example. The consequences of this argument is for bigger, broader resident parking zones which may reduce the costs but have other knock on effects, such as the potential increase in short car trips. For example where a resident knows they can drive to the shops within their zone and as we have seen the appetite from residents is that they are territorial to their zone and who uses it. Reducing complexity could look at options such as:

- Rationalising down the number of parking zones to larger zones
- Rationalising down the number and types of parking permits

Customer Experience/Best Practice

12. The review could support the work to review and embed new technology as mentioned above for better customer service with suggestions of how the customer experience of resident parking could be improved.

Cost

13. Cllr D'Agorne's scrutiny request to the committee was to review the cost to residents. Ultimately the cost of a permit is set by Full Council. The cost of parking increases in recent years has been inflationary. Any surplus from parking can be used, as laid out by law, to subsidise other transport elements. Residents' parking is budgeted to achieve income of £858k. Any change in fees which would lead to a loss of income would require compensatory budget savings to be made.
14. The Committee has formed an informal Task Group to do their own research into what this council and other councils do by way of informing this work and as a comparison. However this report does not cover their findings but will ask that these Members present their findings to the Committee to help inform a view and actions about how the Committee wishes to take this forward.

Council Plan

15. This supports the Council's key priority to listen to residents, as listed in the Council Plan 2015-19.

Implications

16. Financial & HR – As this report is only advisory there are no financial or HR issues. If Elected Members decide to change the charges it reduces the income so there will need to be savings elsewhere to compensate.
17. Equalities – A community impact assessment has not been done for this work given it is at a scoping stage however one will be required if a review taken forward.
18. Legal, Crime & Disorder, ICT, Property - There are no known implications associated with the recommendation in this report.
19. Risk Management - The changes proposed to the city centre in terms of vehicular access are significant and will impact on a section of the community, the opportunity to explore the issues at scrutiny should mitigate this.

Recommendation

20. Members are asked to consider this scoping report and determine the scope of any further work.

Reason: To undertake a meaningful scrutiny into Resident Parking Permits.

Contact Details

Author:
Graham Titchener
Parking Services
Manager
01904 551495

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
James Gilchrist
Assistant Director Transport Highways and
Environment
01904 552547

Report Approved **Date** 9/11/2018

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes:

Annex A – Scrutiny Topic Registration Form

Annex B – Information gathered by Cllr Fenton