



**Notice of a public meeting of  
Economy & Place Policy Development Committee**

- To:** Councillors Cuthbertson (Chair), Kramm (Vice-Chair),  
N Barnes, S Barnes, Cullwick, Rawlings and Steward
- Date:** Tuesday, 5 March 2019
- Time:** 5.30 pm
- Venue:** The Thornton Room - Ground Floor, West Offices (G039)

**AGENDA**

**1. Declarations of Interest**

At this point, Members are asked to declare:

- any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests
- any prejudicial interests or
- any disclosable pecuniary interests

which they may have in respect of business on this agenda.

**2. Minutes**

(Pages 1 - 4)

To approve and sign the minutes of the Economy and Place Policy Development Committee meeting held on 29 January 2019.

**3. Public Participation**

It is at this point in the meeting that members of the public who have registered their wish to speak can do so. The deadline for registering is by **5.00pm** on **Monday 4 March 2019**. Members of the public may speak on an item on the agenda or an issue within the Committee's remit. To register, please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for the meeting (the contact details are available at the foot of the agenda).

## **Filming or Recording Meetings**

Please note that, subject to available resources, this meeting will be filmed and webcast, or recorded, including any registered public speakers, who have given their permission. This broadcast can be viewed at <http://www.york.gov.uk/webcasts>.

Residents are welcome to photograph, film or record Councillors and Officers at all meetings open to the press and public. This includes the use of social media reporting, i.e. tweeting. Anyone wishing to film, record or take photos at any public meeting should contact the Democracy Officer (whose contact details are at the foot of this agenda) in advance of the meeting.

The Council's protocol on Webcasting, Filming & Recording of Meetings ensures that these practices are carried out in a manner both respectful to the conduct of the meeting and all those present. It can be viewed at [http://www.york.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11406/protocol\\_f\\_or\\_webcasting\\_filming\\_and\\_recording\\_of\\_council\\_meetings\\_20160809.pdf](http://www.york.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11406/protocol_f_or_webcasting_filming_and_recording_of_council_meetings_20160809.pdf)

- 4. Residents' Priority Parking Scheme Scrutiny Review Draft Final Report** (Pages 5 - 24)  
This report provides the findings of the scrutiny review of the City of York Council's Residents' Priority Parking Scheme (ResPark) together with the Task Group's review conclusions and draft recommendations, for this Committee's consideration.
- 5. Workplan 2018/19** (Pages 25 - 26)  
Members are asked to consider the Committee's work plan for the remainder of the municipal year.
- 6. Urgent Business**  
Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

Democracy Officer: Angela Bielby

Contact Details:

Tel – (01904) 552599

Email – [a.bielby@york.gov.uk](mailto:a.bielby@york.gov.uk)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports and
- For receiving reports in other formats

Contact details are set out above.

**This information can be provided in your own language.**

我們也用您們的語言提供這個信息 (Cantonese)

এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় দেয়া যেতে পারে। (Bengali)

Ta informacja może być dostarczona w twoim (Polish)  
własnym języku.

Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde almanız mümkündür. (Turkish)

یہ معلومات آپ کی اپنی زبان (بولی) میں بھی مہیا کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ (Urdu)

 (01904) 551550

This page is intentionally left blank

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

Meeting	Economy & Place Policy Development Committee
Date	29 January 2019
Present	Councillors Cuthbertson (Chair), Kramm (Vice-Chair), N Barnes, Cullwick, Steward, Doughty (Substitute for Cllr Rawlings) and Pavlovic (Substitute for Cllr S Barnes)
Apologies	Councillors Rawlings and S Barnes

---

### **32. Declarations of Interest**

Members were asked to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests or any prejudicial or discloseable pecuniary interest that they might have in respect of the business on the agenda. Cllr Pavlovic, in attendance as substitute for Cllr S Barnes, declared an interest in item 4 (Economic Health of York City Centre Final Report) because as Chair of the Economy and Place Scrutiny Committee would be presenting recommendations to the Committee. He therefore did not vote on that item. No further interests were declared.

### **33. Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the last meeting held on 20 November be approved as a correct record and then signed by the Chair.

### **34. Public Participation**

It was reported that there had been one registration to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. Dave Merrett spoke on item 4 (Economic Health of York City Centre Final Report). He highlighted the loss of office space in the city centre and he suggested that the report include a further recommendation around re-looking at Article 4 Directions to protect the existing office space in the city centre.

### **35. Economic Health of York City Centre Final Report**

Members considered a report informing them of the work carried out by members of the Economy and Place Scrutiny Committee into the Economic

Health of York City Centre. Officers outlined the content of the report, which asked the Committee to consider whether it wished to take forward elements of the scrutiny review which related to policy development as identified in the following recommendations, as referred by the Economy and Place Scrutiny Committee. The Economy and Place Scrutiny Committee Chair, Cllr Pavlovic explained the work undertaken by the Committee and he thanked Members for their work. The recommendations of the Economy and Place Scrutiny Committee were:

*That the Council:*

- i. Fully supports the work and ambitions of Indie York in helping further develop and grow the independent business sector in the city and that the Council makes a grant of £10,000 to Indie York to help progress this work;*
- ii. Consider making a bid to the £675 million Future High Streets Fund to secure funding to help York respond and adapt to changes facing city centres.*
- iii. Prepare a long-term strategy to make its high streets and the city centre fit for the future, taking into account relevant aspects of the Grimsey report and the view of all key stakeholders.*
- iv. Develops an easy but comprehensive and consistent guide to help businesses access relevant information around Council policies effecting businesses, such as planning and licensing issues and alike. This could take the form of a booklet which could attract sponsorship.*
- v. Examines ways of extending the city's traditional festivals venue in Parliament Street to open up other areas to visitors, particularly across the river into Micklegate, and reduce pedestrian congestion in parts of the city centre at peak hours.*
- vi. Works with Indie York and traders to develop a city-wide loyalty scheme to make it easier for businesses to reward customers with an attractive discount offer for shopping locally while encouraging business growth and customer retention across a city-wide customer engagement platform.*
- vii. Incentivises ways to further encourage more people to use Park and Ride and work with bus operators to extend the operating hours of Park and Ride to help reduce vehicle congestion in the city.*

Following detailed discussion, Members endorsed the recommendations and agreed that there needed to be further work around looking at Article 4

Directions to protect existing office space in the city centre. This was added onto the work plan for the next meeting on 5 March 2019.

Resolved: That the above recommendations be endorsed and that there be consideration of a further recommendation concerning Article 4 Directions to protect existing office space in the city centre.

Reason: To progress this scrutiny review in accordance with scrutiny protocols and procedures.

### **36. Work Plan 2018/19**

Members considered the Committee's work plan for the remainder of the 2018/19 municipal year.

Members discussed potential topics and it was agreed that the January meeting would include the following items:

- Residents Parking Review Update
- Economic Health of the City Centre (to include discussion on Article 4 Directions to protect existing office space in the city centre)

Members were updated on the progress of the Single Use Plastics scrutiny review being undertaken by an Ad-Hoc Sub-Committee comprising members of this Committee and the Customer and Corporate Services Scrutiny Management Committee. The Scrutiny Officer advised Members that the Customer and Corporate Services Scrutiny Management Committee was undertaking a review of scrutiny arrangements to which the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Scrutiny Committees had been invited to give feedback. The Chair reported on the feedback he had given.

Resolved: That the work plan be approved subject to the inclusion of the items above.

Reason: To keep the Committee's work plan updated.

Cllr I Cuthbertson, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 7.05 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank





---

## **Economy and Place Policy Development Committee**

**5 March 2019**

Report of the ResPark Scrutiny Review Task Group

### **Residents' Priority Parking Scheme Scrutiny Review Draft Final Report**

#### **Summary**

1. This report provides the findings of the scrutiny review of the City of York Council's Residents' Priority Parking Scheme (ResPark) together with the Task Group's review conclusions and draft recommendations, for this Committee's consideration.

#### **Background**

2. At a meeting of the Economy and Place Policy Development Committee in June 2018 Members considered a proposal made by Cllr D'Agorne to review City of York's Residents' Parking Priority Scheme. After advice from Officers, Members agreed to undertake two policy development reviews, starting with an initial review to examine how best to mitigate measures for disabled access against vehicle scrutiny measures around the city centre.
3. This was to be followed by a review of residents' priority parking across the city and the Committee appointed an informal Task Group comprising Cllrs N Barnes, Cullwick, D'Agorne and Steward to carry out some initial research to inform a scoping report to be presented to the Committee's November 2018 meeting.
4. The initial remit for the informal Task Group was on the lines of:

*A holistic review of residents' parking to include a review of the permit types available, the size and appropriateness of zones, and the current process of implementing a scheme. The review should also include examination of alternative models in place elsewhere.*

5. At a meeting of this Committee in November 2018, Members considered a scoping report prepared by officers, along with information received from Cllr Fenton, who replaced Cllr Cullwick on the Task Group in July 2018.
6. At the meeting it was agreed that the Task Group needed to narrow its scope so the review could be completed within a realistic timeframe and the Task Group agreed the following refined remit:

**Aim:**

To understand York's Residents' Parking Priority Scheme (ResPark) and identify efficiency savings that can be made, to both lower costs and make the scheme work better for residents.

**Objectives:**

- i. To examine different or simplified processes that can be used, e.g. the use of new technology;
- ii. To consider the size and extent of York's ResPark zones and whether there would be value in increasing the size of some zones;
- iii. To investigate best practice and different resident parking models in use elsewhere.

**Background Information**

7. The Residents' Priority Parking Scheme 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 all valid permit holders including residents and property owners.
8. 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
  - Disabled parking permits
9. Permits are also available for people who may own properties within a zone, or have a commercial requirement for parking there:

- Guest house parking permits
- Property parking permits
- Landlord and management agents permits
- Business parking permits
- Commercial parking permits
- Community parking permits

10. 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 motor vehicle, with the exception of motorcycles and the first household permit.

### **Information Gathered**

11. As part of the work of the informal Task Group, Cllr Fenton met staff from the Parking and Customer Services teams to gather information on the operation of the current ResPark scheme from a customer perspective. His findings include:
- There is comprehensive information available online about the Council's ResPark scheme, at <https://www.york.gov.uk/ResPark>
  - If you move into a property that is in a ResPark area, and would like to apply for a permit, you need to download a PDF form from the website and complete it by hand. You can send it to City of York Council by post with a cheque, or call into West Offices in person with your form and pay by cheque or card.
  - There are different forms for different permits. For example if you want a household permit and an additional permit, you have to complete multiple forms.
  - Household permits are not vehicle-specific (unless one of the discount categories applies), but additional permits are.
  - There are discounts for small cars (e.g. Smart cars) or low emission vehicles.
  - You can buy a permit for 3, 6, 9 or 12 months. CYC will send you a letter 6 weeks before your permit expires inviting you to renew by

post or by coming into West Offices.

- When you purchase a household permit, you will receive an authorisation card, which enables you to buy permits for visitors to use. Visitor permits come in books of 5 and each book currently costs £6.25. You can buy a maximum of 6 books per calendar month and 40 books in a year. To buy visitor permits you can either come to West Offices with your authorisation card and payment or apply by post enclosing your authorisation card, details of how many books you require, and your payment.
- If you don't have a car, but would like visitor permits, you need to obtain an authorisation card in order to apply for visitor permits.
- Large developments in ResPark areas (e.g. a large block of flats built on the site of a former pub) are not normally included in the ResPark scheme.
- In the Customer Contact Centre there are usually 2 or 3 members of staff dedicated to Parking Services.
- CYC currently has 17 licences for the parking software it uses, this limits the number of staff who can work on ResPark matters unless more licenses are purchased. The support for the current parking back office system expires in October 2019, so a replacement will need to be in place by then.

12. Cllr Barnes noted that during his investigations on behalf of the informal task group he found a certain amount of frustration among residents applying for residents' parking over the length of time that could be taken to implement schemes. He acquired the following information from Network Management:

#### Residents' Parking Schemes Waiting List

13. Residents parking schemes are dealt with in order of when they are received. Typically 2 schemes might be introduced per year but this depends on funding and staffing needed against other workload priorities.

Process	Approximate timescale
<p><b>Stage 1 – initiation</b></p> <p>The request (normally by petition) indicating significant support in an area or street is reported for either approval to take forward or refuse.</p>	8 weeks

14. When the potential scheme reaches the top of the list work begins. The time between Stage 1 and 2 varies significantly depending on the length of the waiting list.

<p><b>Stage 2 – start of project</b></p> <p>A draft scheme and questionnaire will be sent out to all properties within the proposed area. A proposal will normally be taken forward if there is at least a 50% response rate and the majority of returns are in favour. Depending on circumstances, there is potential for individual streets to go forward from an area if the streets return is very positive whilst the areas is either low or opposed.</p> <p>The consultation is then reported along with a proposed scheme for approval to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).</p> <p>TRO preparation and advertising</p> <p>Any objections to the proposed TRO are then reported for consideration.</p> <p>If the objections are overturned by the Executive Member for Transport the scheme will then be implemented.</p>	<p>6-8 weeks</p> <p>8 weeks</p> <p>4-6 weeks</p> <p>8 weeks</p> <p>12-15 weeks</p>
---	--

15. Once work on a scheme begins it will normally take 9 months to complete.

Waiting List

Area	Date received	Progress (NOTE: not all will get through to implementation)	
Rosedale Street Petition	April 2017	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes Yes Yes Yes DEC
Danesmead estate Petition (including Fulford Cross)  <b>SEE LINK BELOW (Fulford Cross undergoing a Second consultation, Danesmead to take forward)</b>	April 2017	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report  TRO advertised  Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes Yes/ June/Oct  Dec/Jan
Clifton Dale	June 2017	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes
Broadway / Westfield Drive <b>LINK with Danesmead estate above (Insufficient support from these streets)</b>	Sept. 2017	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report  TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes Yes/June Oct  No Further Action

Pasture Farm Close	Sept. 2017	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes
Albemarle Road (15- 37)	Jan 2018	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes
Main Avenue, First Avenue and Second Avenue	May. 2018	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes
Balmoral Terrace	June. 2018	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes
Farrar Street	Oct 2018	Reported Consultation carried out Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Feb 2019

Area	Date received	Finished	
South Bank Avenue Petition	Summer 2016	Implemented	Yes
Butcher Terrace area Petition	Summer 2016	Implemented	Yes
Phoenix Boulevard Petition	Summer 2016	Implemented	Yes
Railway Terrace / St Paul's area Petition	Summer 2016	Implemented	Yes
St. Aubyn's Place	February 2017	Implemented	Yes
St. John's Place and Chestnut Court	August 2017	Reported	NO ACTION
Sussex Road Petition	May 2017	Reported, consulted, Insufficient support	NO ACTION

16. Since the way in which CYC monitors its petitions process was passed to the Customer and Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee at the end of 2014 there have been 18 petitions from resident groups asking for their area or street to be included in the Residents' Priority Parking Scheme, many citing commuter parking as the reason for their actions.
17. In early January 2019 the Task Group held an informal public meeting to help gauge public opinion around residents' parking schemes and to gather further views to inform their considerations.
18. At the same time there was a poll on the York Press website seeking public views on resident parking. More than 1,000 people took part in the York Press poll with 72% saying they were happy with the current scheme.
19. At the beginning of the public meeting it was explained that the Task Group was looking to identify efficiency savings to make ResPark work better for residents, but not at the price of resident parking permits. Even so, several residents raised the issue of permit pricing as being a bone of contention.



20. At the meeting residents who attended made a number of comments expressing both support and criticism of the current arrangements. These included:

- York's ResPark is very good and value for money;
- Allow payments to be made monthly by direct debit;
- Allow shops to sell visitor permits;
- Wardens and back office staff are very helpful;
- Parking permits should be vehicle registration specific;
- Technology is available to introduce virtual permits and apply for permits online.
- Small zones should be retained;
- Volunteer wardens could be enlisted to help enforcement;
- Permits should be displayed in vehicles so residents can easily identify who is eligible to park within the zone, and who is not;
- Allow visitor scratch cards to be transferable to enable them to be used by more than one visitor on the same day;
- Residents' parking should be considered as part of York parking strategy;
- Permitted waiting times within ResPark zones need to be looked at area by area as 10-minute parking allowance is widely abused;
- To prevent commuter parking consider one or two-hour restrictions;
- We are desperate for residents' parking;
- Consideration for Park and Ride buses to stop at every bus stop to more people would use them;
- People with ResPark permits who cannot find anywhere to park within their zones should be allowed to park in the nearest CYC car park for free;

21. Conversely:

- Don't want these schemes imposed on us;
- Don't want virtual permits;
- Virtual permits – not all residents have the technology to check the legitimacy of vehicles parking in their zone;
- Wrong that people with low emission vehicles don't get any benefits;
- Would prefer bigger ResPark zones. Nine zones within a five minute walk from my house;
- Never see any parking wardens;
- People don't get caught parking in ResPark areas or on double yellow lines near shops;
- Too many vehicles in the city. Where people have several vehicles or where they are Houses of Multiple Occupancy these schemes will not work;
- Up to resident to petition for a parking scheme but they are not agreed as part of a strategy;
- If residents cannot park near where they live, what is the point of ResPark?
- Cost of resident-only parking permits should be spread across all York Council Tax payers;
- ResPark schemes should not be used to generate income for the Council.

22. In addition to the comments above other residents made written submissions about ResPark and these included:

- If it is an environmental tax on car owners why is it not imposed on those with driveways as well? In my street we have a number of high value homes with driveways on which park large highly polluting cars, yet they will not be taxed according to their emissions or the number of cars at the household. Only those living in terrace houses without driveways will be taxed and by their nature will probably be lower income households i.e. it is a regressive tax.

- With the consultation, those with driveways have equal weight when it comes to voting on whether a scheme comes into force, yet because they have a driveway, will not suffer the additional tax which might easily be imposed upon a car owner who lives in a terraced house without a drive who voted against the scheme. This seems grossly unfair.
- I rarely use my car as I walk or cycle to work, yet with some ResPark areas there is a M-F 9am-5pm restriction. So if I drove my car to work everyday I could possibly avoid paying for a permit. As such, I could be penalised for being environmentally conscience and not using my car on a daily basis.
- I do not expect to be able to park outside of my house and will often find a parking space in adjoining streets. Because ResPark schemes are zoned, this could make it far more difficult for me to find a parking space and for the residential parking load to be distributed around a larger residential area. The scheme should cover much larger areas rather than small zones.
- I have a disabled father and often cannot park my car near my house when he comes to visit. He cannot walk far so often I have to drop him off at my house and go to look for somewhere to park, often streets away and then go to get my car to take him home
- Non residents park their cars all day. It seems these are people who work in town and park in our street to save on car park costs, so it could be beneficial to the Council to obtain more parking fees in the car parks and Park & Ride
- Non residents often park on double yellow lines. Quite often these are the same cars I have reported but nothing seems to be done. They park at the ends of the streets making it difficult to get round the corners with wheelchairs and prams.
- Some residents say friends and family often don't come to see them as they cannot park near their house. This is most distressing for them, especially an elderly lady who lives in my street
- Non residents park in the alley ways again blocking prams and wheelchairs, but more importantly emergency vehicles would have difficulty getting to the back of houses for fires and emergency ambulances

- A lot of residents who would be willing to pay for parking in our streets
- It would also help with traffic in the area if it was residential parking only

23. Separately the Assistant Director for Transport, Highways and Environment has been in communication with a Heworth resident whose house is in a Residents' Parking Zone. The house was finished four years ago and has a garage, so has no resident parking permit. However, he has been told that he not eligible for visitor permits, which has caused problems when workmen have needed to visit the property.

### **Residents' Parking Models used elsewhere.**

24. Sheffield City Council

Earlier this year Sheffield introduced a paperless system for Residents' Parking Schemes which was rolled out in two Phases. Phase 1 deals with residents, businesses permits and green permits while Phase 2 incorporates visitor, trade and utility permits.

The benefit for the customer is that evidence no longer has to be provided up front. Eligibility checks can be done after the paperless permit is issued, so the customer can now apply and pay in the same transaction.

In the paper system all evidence has to be supplied and thoroughly checked before a paper permit is issued. This often means customers have multiple contacts with the council to perform the one transaction. This all takes significant time and is inconvenient to the customer.

With paperless permits, once the customer has applied and paid in the same transaction, the permit is issued. There is nothing to print off or display.

Civil Enforcement Officers enter a vehicle's registration in their handheld device, which is updated overnight from the permit database. This will show whether the vehicle has a valid permit for that parking zone.

The difference with the phase 2 permit is they are a type of voucher that is not necessarily required every day. This means the customer needs to activate a voucher when they wish to use it. So instead of placing a physical voucher in a car's windscreen and validating it by marking the

date, they will go online on enter a pin number and registration.

25. Cambridge City Council

As of November 2018 there are 19 residents' parking zones in central Cambridge, with more being consulted on. These limit parking to residents between 9am and either 5pm or 8pm and either six or seven days a week.

As part of the expansion of residents' parking zones Cambridge is considering a city-wide approach. The Council considers the process of iterative expansion invariably pushes a problem onto a new set of residents and only marginally reduces congestion. It considers a city-wide approach to be more effective and less divisive. The feeling is that the problem of commuter parking is now acute in many parts of Cambridge, so a co-ordinated rather than piecemeal response is needed.

26. Watford Borough Council.

In April 2018 Watford introduced a new system to allow residents and business to apply for a permit 24/7 and receive their virtual permit instantly. They no longer need to wait for a paper permit to arrive in the post for them to display in their car. Council staff add permit details to the new system and vehicles are instantly covered with a virtual permit.

Civil Enforcement Officers scan car number plates using a handheld device with recognition software to link permit-holders to the number plate of their car to find out if a vehicle has a permit or not, saving them time as they will no longer have to add in the number plate manually.

Virtual visitor permits involve householders registering an account that will allow them to buy time for their visitors by telephone, online or a mobile phone app. Civil Enforcement Officers can then use a handheld device to confirm that the visiting vehicle is covered by a valid parking session.

27. Wokingham Borough Council

From October 2018 Wokingham Borough Council has been issuing virtual permits for all on and off-street parking. This applies to Resident Parking Permits and season tickets.

Virtual permits mean motorists no longer need to display a paper permit in their vehicles when parking in a Residents' Parking Zone. After residents have completed their online applications parking enforcement officers will instantly know if a vehicle has an active permit.

28. Oxfordshire County Council

Resident parking schemes in Oxford are undergoing a major programme of extensions ahead of the implementation of a city centre clean air zone in 2020. A report which ranks Oxford's areas from those which most need controlled parking zones to those which need them least has been approved by the county council. However, the cost of implementing all the controlled parking zones will top £3m and as there is only £861,000 in the current spending pot some prioritisation will be necessary.

In Oxford zones vary in their times of operation and restriction, which are detailed within the zones. These vary from strictly permit holders only, to 30 minute parking spaces through to three hour parking spaces in some areas and dependent on the time of day.

29. Brighton and Hove

In Brighton and Hove the hours of operation of Resident Parking Zones are 9am to 8pm or 'light touch schemes' for limited periods during the day, such as 10am to 11am and 7pm to 9pm or 11am to noon and 6pm to 7pm. The limited period zones have the advantage of focussing enforcement activity while precluding all day and evening parking but still allowing free visitor parking during early morning and afternoons.

30. Wandsworth Borough Council

In Wandsworth there are two main types of parking control: all-day restrictions and one-hour restrictions and a Controlled Parking Zone can be made up of a mixture of the two. The one hour zones operate for one hour per day – usually Monday to Friday, and are designed specifically to deter commuters. They allow others to park without restriction outside the specified hour.

**Analysis**

31. Parking in residential areas is a broad and high profile subject and all aspects of parking ranging from permits, the physical space to park, enforcement, maintenance and so on, are intrinsically linked.
32. Residents' Priority Parking Schemes allow businesses and residents in those areas relief from the detrimental effects of all-day commuter and shopper parking which can cause significant issues in those areas. They are designed to improve residents' ability to park near their properties.

33. The significant number and small size of the resident parking zones increases complexity. These have been implemented over many years since the early 1980s where between then and up to 2003 there were 29 zones across the city. Since then it has increased to 61 with more being implemented and more waiting to be reviewed, all of which are instigated by residents and/or Ward Councillors. This provides 5,220 parking spaces, including 380 which are also Pay and Display.
34. The cost of running the resident parking scheme is complex because York has chosen to implement very small, often single-street ResPark schemes which could mean some zones may be disproportionately expensive to implement and there is a 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.
35. 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 an extended zone. 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 including simplifying to period of validity e.g. only offering annual or monthly payment options.
36. The piecemeal response to resident parking areas invariably pushes the problem of commuter / shopper parking onto a different set of neighbouring residents. A city-wide approach can be more effective and less divisive but would inevitably mean larger resident parking zones and the temptation for residents to drive within those zones for short journeys to shops etc.
37. No figures have been published for the numbers of commuter vehicles parking on residential streets across York, but anecdotal figures suggest it is likely to be in the low thousands and that 'cruising' in search of parking spaces adds to congestion, pollution and annoyance for residents.
38. 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. Options for future development once the IT system is in place include digital/virtual parking permits.

39. The price of a permit is set by Full Council as part of the annual budget setting process. The cost of permit 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 changes that would lead to a loss of income would require compensatory budget savings to be made.
40. One or two-hour resident only zones, as detailed in paragraphs 28 and 29 above, can offer two advantages for residents in that visitor and contractors do not need a permit if they can avoid parking during restricted hours and that enforcement activity can be focused while precluding all day parking.
41. The cost of enforcement is roughly proportional to the number of times a zone is patrolled. A one-hour restriction need only be patrolled once, which requires far fewer patrol hours than say, eight-hour restrictions which may need to be patrolled hourly. If contiguous one-hour zones have sequential hour restrictions (Zone a: 10-11am, Zone B: 11am-noon, Zone C: noon-1pm, etc) a single Civil Enforcement Officer can cover several zones in a day. It is therefore reasonable to believe that one-hour resident parking zones would be easier and cheaper to enforce. Hours chosen would need to take account of local circumstances e.g. workplace, school, nursery, business, church etc as the source of the problem.
42. Occupiers of new homes built within Residents' Parking Zones are not eligible for residents' permits so these new developments do not add to the parking pressure within these zones. However, under current arrangements they are also not eligible for visitor permits and this can cause problems when workmen need to visit the property, see paragraph 23. In such instances it may be possible to offer limited visitor parking vouchers, say six a year.

### **Consultation**

43. To gather the information in this report, Members of the Task Group met residents during an informal public meeting, canvassed other residents for their views and considered the findings of a residents' parking poll on the York Press website. They have also met with the Assistant Director for Transport, Highways and Environment, the Head of Parking Services, Network Management and Parking and Customer Services.



## Conclusions

44. The cost of running some Resident Parking Schemes in York is disproportionately expensive because of the piecemeal implementation of zones within the city. York currently has 61 zones, often single street zones, with more waiting to be reviewed. There is an argument for rationalising the number of zones to create larger zones as this would reduce complexity and potentially reduce costs. Creating larger zones would also encourage people to use park and ride, rather than trying to find on-street parking in the city, which would help reduce congestion in the central area.
45. The current approach ensures that residents in potential new areas are consulted fully but creates a creeping spread of zones with knock on effects in surrounding streets rather than a planned, more holistic approach across all streets affected by commuter parking.
46. Similarly there is an argument for rationalising parking permits themselves so there is more standardisation on permit length. This could be achieved by simplifying the period of validity from the current 3, 6, 9 or 12 month permits by offering annual or monthly permits.
47. Some residents have expressed frustration at the length of time taken for residents' parking zones to be investigated and implemented and it would be helpful, resources permitting, if a realistic timeframe could be agreed from CYC receiving the initial request to the process being completed.
48. Cost saving and customer service improvements can also be achieved by improved online services to residents. Options for future development once the new parking system is in place include the introduction of virtual permits and an online self-service for residents to allow online application and payment for parking permits and visitor vouchers,
49. Virtual permits and different patterns of operation have been shown to work effectively in other authorities and could be considered for implementation in York. A transition to a system of virtual permits would eliminate the need for paper permits to be displayed in a vehicle when it is parked in a ResPark zone. With virtual permits residents will no longer have to wait for a paper permit to arrive in the post as after they have completed their online application parking enforcement officers will instantly know if a vehicle has an active permit.

50. If and when virtual permits are introduced in York there could also be an opportunity for residents to digital technology to enable them to check a registration number and if a vehicle is parked illegally the information is passed to enforcement officers.
51. Finally, while new developments within existing ResPark zones are usually agreed with a condition that they do not increase parking pressures within that area and therefore the new residents are not eligible for resident parking permits or visitor vouchers, there could be some leeway to give these residents the option to apply for a limited number of visitor vouchers, say six a year, should they have visitors such as workmen undertaking essential work on their properties.

### **Review Recommendations**

52. Having considered the information provided in this report the Committee is asked to recommend to the Executive that the Corporate Director of Economy and Place:
  - i. Reviews the current pattern of ResPark zones with a view to rationalising them and identifying the most logical extensions into surrounding streets that suffer from non-resident parking;
  - ii. Rationalises parking permits so there is more standardisation on permit length (i.e. the current 3, 6 and 12 month permits) by offering annual or monthly permits.
  - iii. Seeks to ensure residents' petitions for new zones are investigated and (if agreed) implemented as soon as possible, aiming for within a year.
  - iv. Introduces an online self-service for customers to encourage online application and payment for parking permits and visitor vouchers, same day online payment for parking tickets, and to automate the requirement for evidence;
  - v. Investigates the transition to a system of virtual permits, initially within a trial zone, to eliminate the need for paper permits through Automatic Number Plate Recognition and better links to DVLA to help enforcement;
  - vi. Investigates digital options once virtual permits are in operation that will enable residents to check a registration number so if a vehicle

is illegally parked the information is electronically passed to enforcement officers.

- vii. Examines the implications of allowing residents of new properties within existing ResPark zones to purchase a limited number of visitor vouchers.

### **Options**

53. The Committee may choose to either endorse the draft recommendations contained in this report or identify alternative or additional recommendation(s) for presentation to the Executive.

### **Council Plan**

54. This supports the Council's key priority to listen to residents, as listed in the Council Plan 2015-19.
55. Within the Local Transport Plan sustainable forms of transport are prioritised above private car usage.

### **Implications**

56. **Financial:** A review and rationalisation of ResPark zones would need to be completed within existing resources. If an agreed timescale for the introduction of new zones were agreed this would also need to be able to be met from within existing budgets. There is a current project and budget to replace the parking IT systems. Any IT improvements would need to be met from within this budget or additional growth would need to be agreed through the annual budget process.
  - **Human Resources (HR):** There are no HR implications
  - **Equalities:** There are no equalities implications
  - **Legal:** Enforcement of parking permits is covered in the body of this report.
  - **Crime and Disorder:** There are no crime and disorder implications
  - **Information Technology (IT):** There is a project underway to replace the parking back office system through replacement/enhancement of the Oracle Customer Relationship Management system which will present the opportunity to improve parking processes for the benefit of

the customer and staff. Applying online and making the payment is a future development and relies on the technology being in place to do so.

- **Property:** There are no property implications
- **Other:** There are no other implications

### **Risk Management**

57. There are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report. However, the risk of doing nothing is that the current concerns raised by Members and residents are not addressed.

### **Recommendations**

58. Having considered the information in this draft final report Members are asked to:

- i. Consider and agree the draft recommendations arising from the review as shown in paragraph 52 above;

Reason: To conclude the work of this review in line with scrutiny procedures and protocols and enable this review final report to be presented to the Executive.

### **Contact Details**

**Author:**

Steve Entwistle

Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 01904 554279

[steven.entwistle@york.gov.uk](mailto:steven.entwistle@york.gov.uk)

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Dawn Steel

Head of Democratic Services

Tel: 01904 551030

[dawn.steel@york.gov.uk](mailto:dawn.steel@york.gov.uk)

**Report Approved**  **Date** 4/02/2019

**Wards Affected:**

**All**



**For further information please contact the author of the report**

## Economy & Place Policy Development Committee - Workplan 2018-19

19 June 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attendance of Exec Mbr for Economic Dev &amp; Comm Engagement - Priorities &amp; Challenges for 2018/19</li> <li>2. Creative Strategy for York - with attendance of Head of Science City York (Heather Niven)</li> <li>3. Residents Parking Scrutiny Topic Feasibility Report (James Gilchrist/Graham Titchener)</li> <li>4. Workplan 2018/19</li> <li>5. <i>Urgent Business</i> – Draft Service Specification for Make it York Contract 2018-21(Charlie Croft)</li> </ol>
17 July 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attendance of Exec Mbr for Environment - Priorities &amp; Challenges for 2018/19</li> <li>2. Attendance of Exec Mbr for Transport &amp; Planning,</li> <li>3. Presentation on Economic Strategy Progress inc. Strategy Review Plan &amp; Update on Local Industrial Strategy (Simon Brereton) – <i>deferred from June 2018 meeting</i></li> <li>4. Workplan 2018/19</li> </ol>
18 Sept 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction to City Centre Access Works &amp; Initial Consultation on City Centre Disabled Parking (</li> <li>2. Overview of Planned Work to Enhance Economic Growth in Secondary Shopping Areas</li> <li>3. Update Report on Street Lighting Policy</li> <li>4. Workplan 2018/19</li> </ol>
Nov 2018	Business Week – Conference on the Future of York’s Economy
20 Nov 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Residents Parking Review Scoping Report (James Gilchrist)</li> <li>2. Update on Development of a Community Asset Strategy for York (Tracey Carter) (moved from Sept agenda) (Neil Ferris 030918)</li> <li>3. Briefing paper on the changes to LEP geographies on York</li> <li>4. Workplan 2018/19</li> </ol>
22 Jan 2019	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. E&amp;P Scrutiny Report into Economic Health of York City Centre</li> <li>2. Verbal update on Residents’ Priority Parking Scrutiny review</li> <li>3. Workplan 2018/19</li> </ol>

5 March 2019	1. ResPark Scrutiny review Draft Final Report. 2. Workplan 2018/19
--------------	---

Future Areas of Policy Development

- Economic Strategy 2020–2025 - Building in Economic Metrics & Performance Assessment
- Community Infrastructure Levy
- Supplementary Planning Guidance – Priorities for York
- Policy on Crossing Points