

Report of the Director of City Strategy

## **REVIEW OF PARKING SERVICES**

### **SUMMARY**

1. This report summaries the outcome of a review of parking services. It outlines the results of an in depth review of the enforcement, administration and management of parking services and recommends opportunities for improvements.
2. From the Policy Review Programme a number of issues have been considered within the report and recommendations are made for approval. These include: -
  - The adoption of a new parking policy that meets the existing objectives but links parking with the council's strategy on transport, the economy and environment.
  - A proposal to review alternative options for delivery of the enforcement service.
  - A proposal to carry out a trial on the pay on exit method of payment in car parks.
  - A review of the possibility of introducing a permit scheme for environmentally friendly vehicles.
  - A review of the car park charges.

### **BACKGROUND**

3. Parking in York has a strategic importance and influence upon the City's economic and transport performance. Without an adequate transport system and network the economic vitality of the city would be restricted. Parking when used as a demand management tool for traffic can and does help to keep issues such as congestion in balance, encouraging the use of public transport, cycling and walking. This balance is most noticeable with the transfer from car use and the city's car parks to the park and ride service.
4. Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) was introduced across the whole of the City of York Council area on 8 October 2000. These powers transferred responsibility for parking enforcement from the Police to the City Council and thus for the first time placed both the Order making and Order enforcing abilities within the same hands. The change was not accompanied

by any alterations in any on or off street restrictions although every regulation was physically checked against the relevant Order for compliance.

5. Prior to the introduction of DPE all signing associated with any regulation that would be enforced by the city council was physically checked and where required any discrepancies rectified. All Residents Priority Parking (Respark) scheme signs were replaced so as to simplify enforcement under the 1991 Act powers.
6. Enforcement activity is undertaken 7 days a week ordinarily between 07.45 hours and 21.30 hours although very occasional exercises may be mounted outside these times in respect of specific enforcement issues. These additional patrols have to be undertaken on a voluntary basis and Parking Attendants are reluctant to work outside contractual hours. Patrols are undertaken on foot and by motorcycle. The service has transport, which is used to move Parking Attendants around from one patrol area to another. A 'Hot-Line' system is in operation that allows any individual to report a possible contravention to a dedicated free telephone number. The service is organised such that any call received during normal duty hours is attended within a target time of 30 minutes from receipt of the call. The parking office is open 6 days a week including Saturdays.
7. Parking Services is responsible for the day to day running of:
  - Management of the Council's car parks.
  - On and off-street enforcement of the various Parking Regulations.
  - Cash collection from Pay and Display machines.
  - The issue of permits for the resident parking schemes and season tickets and other parking permits.
  - Operation of the Shambles Pay on Foot Car Park.
  - Administration of the council's penalty charge notice processing service and collating evidence for appeals to the independent parking adjudicator.
8. Fundamentally Parking Services exists to deliver the following outcomes:
  - Streets that are clear of unnecessary obstructions.
  - Parking areas that are well regulated.
  - A fair opportunity for all to park in any areas where parking is permitted.
  - Sufficient income to enable the council to minimise its financial call upon charge payers when delivering council wide services.
9. Over the past 2 years reports have been presented to the Executive concerning the level and type of parking charges. As a consequence a range of changes have been made, with a number of new initiatives being introduced. The table in Appendix A provides a brief overview of the work done to date and the actions taken.
10. Whilst the Service is commonly considered to be a single operation it is in reality three separate business units:

- Residents Parking (Respark).
- Enforcement and Revenue protection.
- Parking sales.

Each of these has separate financial objectives:

- Respark and Enforcement and Revenue protection have the objective of breaking even so that income balances expenditure.
- Parking sales has the objective of maximizing sales and hence income to support the council's transport related services.

In regard to parking surplus the Council is obliged by legislation to use any excess income over expenditure to support transport related services.

11. Functional and Financial Reviews of Parking Services were undertaken at the end of last year, which identified issues for change and improvement for both the enforcement, and administration of the service.
12. At a meeting of the Urgency Committee on 26 June 2007, Members received a report, which sought their views on evening parking charges following the approval of the Policy Prospectus by the Executive on 12 June 2007. A decision on the issue was considered to be urgent owing to the perceived impact of evening parking charges on York's evening economy. The Executive Leader accepted and endorsed the advice of the Urgency Committee to allow Minster Badge holders to park free of charge.
13. A summary of the key information for parking services is included in Appendix B, the highlights of that are: -
  - In 2006/7 Parking Services exceeded its projected financial contribution to the council budget by £193,117, which is only 5% of the budgeted net income.
  - City Council off street car parking capacity will reduce from 4,344 in 2000 to 2,693 in 2008 with the loss of Kent Street, Shambles and Haymarket.
  - The number of permits issued in 2006/7 was 5,526 for household and other resident permits and 155,000 to visitors.
  - The number of parking charge notices fell from 28,467 in 2005/6 to 23,418 in 2006/7.

## **SERVICE REVIEWS**

14. Parking Services is frequently in the public eye and the services that it provides regularly the focus of media, public and Member scrutiny. Overwhelmingly this focus stems from the fact that the Service deals with areas that are inherently unpopular such as the issuing of PCN's and the sale of permits to residents, many of whom are opposed to having to pay 'to park outside my own home'. Whilst this is understandable, there is a clear confusion in the mind of those criticising the Service over the role of the Service and the way that it delivers the enforcement activities that it provides. The result is that Parking Services staff have been used as a

focus for adverse comments because they provide a visible presence and the parking function itself has been criticised for being financially led.

15. Against the background of the criticism of the Service, the Review sought to establish how well the outcomes described in paragraph 8 are being achieved. It also sought to identify improvements that would lead to better efficiency, effectiveness or economies in the service as well as benchmarking the service against other providers.
16. To ensure that the service was examined impartially the financial management arrangements were investigated by the Council's Internal Audit team as part of the routine audit programme. All other matters were looked at as a functional review by a specialist firm of Parking Consultants.

## **Summary of Review**

17. In terms of the delivery of the four key outcomes the review concluded that:
  - There is clear evidence that the work of the enforcement team is having a beneficial impact upon levels of obstruction and that compliance with regulations is increasing.
  - The parking areas within the control of the Council are well run and well regulated.
  - There is no evidence to suggest that there is wide spread abuse of the controls upon the duration of permitted parking, either on street or off street.
  - Income levels set in the budget are being achieved (although there is a concern).
18. The review concluded that the systems, structures and practices are generally good. There is a high expectation on the enforcement team particularly with a downward trend on the issuing of Parking Charge Notices (PCNs). Income from parking is generally under pressure as a result of the reduction in the number of PCNs issued and the reduction in the car parking capacity. The review also identified some procedural financial control weaknesses that needed to be addressed in the administration team but there was no evidence of any consequential loss to the council.
19. Based upon evidence of a benchmarking exercise between, York, Canterbury, Cambridge and Peterborough, the parking attendants spend less time of their working day on patrol than average and the availability of attendants is reduced due to high sickness levels and their working practices. In addition the council has more attendants than others but issue fewer penalty charge notices overall. The number of challenges to PCNs is higher than normal and this requires significant administration and management. However the number of challenges resulting in independent adjudication is extremely small by comparison.

20. In terms of administration, the permit structure is the most complex ever encountered however it is recognised that they all perform a need within the community.
21. Whilst there are good practices and systems it was identified that the council should have a clear parking policy, and, under the Traffic Management Act 2004, will be expected to publish an Annual Report. In addition there needs to be a clear protocol of rules within which the parking attendants should operate and which also details how challenges to PCNs are dealt with.

### **Actions recommended as a result of the Review**

22. The results of the Review suggest that action is needed to: -

#### Enforcement

- Increase the number of staff on patrol at any one time.
- Ensure that, when on patrol, staff enforce where their efforts will deliver the outcomes desired by the council, particularly in terms of keeping the streets free of unnecessary obstructions.
- Improve the quality of PCN's (so as to reduce the potential for customers to challenge their issue).

#### Administration

- Review the complexity of the permit system.
- Consider ways in which the administration of the permit system can be improved so as to minimise the amount of staff time involved.
- Introduce additional financial procedures.
- Consider changes to various financial procedures as detailed in Appendix C.

#### Public Perception

- Agree a clear parking policy.
- Publish an annual report detailing the performance of the service using clear performance measures; this report to include clear financial information explaining what the income from parking is used for.
- Prepare protocols for the enforcement procedures and PCN processing.

## DISCUSSION

### Parking Policy

23. The review team recommended the review and clarification of the parking policy. York was amongst the first in the country to use parking as a land use planning and traffic demand management tool and a core means of ensuring that its transport policies are effective.
24. It is therefore recommended that the following policy statement be adopted which can be placed in the public domain on the council's web site.

*“The exercise of control over the availability of both on and off street parking is central to the delivery of the council's land use and transport policies and has an influence upon economic growth and impacts upon the environment of the city.”*

- *The price, location and availability of parking at origin and destination are a crucial factor in an individual's choice of journey mode. The council therefore seeks to limit the amount of parking to service new developments through a range of parking standards so as to manage car ownership levels within the city.*
- *The council also exercises control over its on and off street parking stock through pricing and availability so as to discourage all day commuting into the city centre by private car.*
- *Pricing is also used so as to encourage a regular turn over of use of parking spaces and thus facilitate the availability of parking for short duration trips.*
- *To prevent displacement of parking as a result of these policies adversely impacting upon the amenities of residents and the ability of the emergency services to function, it operates further policies designed to manage on street parking.*
- *In order to provide and facilitate general access to the city centre, the council operates an extensive Park and Ride network with pricing geared to encourage use by those requiring medium to long stay parking.*
- *Through effective enforcement of the necessary regulations its Parking Service has the primary objective of ensuring that the council's overall Parking objectives are delivered.*

### Reduction in Council Car Parking Capacity

25. In the recent past some city council car parks have been disposed of including Heworth Green, Toft Green, Tanner Row and Kent Street. In the future Shambles and Haymarket will be disposed of and there are further possibilities that Castle Mills and Peel Street will close. The impact of the loss of Kent Street, Shambles and Haymarket will be an overall reduction in council owned car park capacity of 22% (745 spaces) and consequential loss in income.

26. Some of the lost car parking capacity has however been provided by the private sector with car parks in Piccadilly, Tanner Row and Stonebow as well as smaller car parks located throughout the city of between 10-20 spaces.
27. Whilst the overall number of spaces in the city has remained relatively constant the private sector charges are slightly lower than the council's, apart from at Foss Bank. Appendix I provides a table showing the comparative charges both locally and nationally.
28. The impact of this loss of council controlled parking is that the transport policies for the city become more uncertain given that parking is a demand management tool to encourage more use of public transport. In addition the loss of revenue puts greater pressure upon other council services.

### **Enforcement**

29. Parking services exceeded its projected contribution to the Council's Budget in 2006/7 despite a significantly lower income from PCN's. The reductions in the amount of council controlled off street car parking over the next three years combined with the year on year downward trend in the volume of PCNs issued will result in an increased pressure on net revenue.
30. The review also identified inefficiencies in the present enforcement arrangements that potentially could be resulting in a lower level of PCNs issued than might otherwise be the case.
31. The parking attendants operate under a local agreement first introduced following decriminalised parking enforcement. The agreement includes a number of restrictive working practices that reduce their flexibility and inhibits the amount of time spent patrolling streets and car parks. Previous attempts to modify the agreement have been met with resistance by the trade unions and the staff. To improve efficiency and effectiveness of enforcement the agreement needs to be replaced with arrangements that improve flexibility and accountability of the enforcement service.
32. Action has to be taken to re-evaluate how enforcement is undertaken with a view to eliminating these inefficiencies and minimising costs. It is therefore proposed that structured negotiations are entered into with the trade unions and staff to achieve new arrangements in advance of the completion of the job evaluation process.
33. Alternatively the improvements may be achieved by seeking alternative external providers for the service. However a number of authorities that have chosen this alternative have experienced service delivery problems that have resulted in the service being brought back in-house.
34. There may be a range of options and potential actions that could be considered by Members to address this and a further report is proposed for the future.

## **Pay on Exit**

35. The Retail Strategy Group have requested the Council to consider a Pay on Exit system for the council's car parks. Members will recall that the Pay on Exit system was discussed in a report to the Executive dated 26 September 2005. That report concluded that the introduction of the arrangement would not be cost effective. Appendix D is an extract from that report with all of the relevant details and costs (at that time).
36. Since the date of that report Pay by Mobile Phone has been introduced. This is proving to be very popular with some 5% (7,000) of total monthly transactions undertaken by this method and the number has been rising steadily since it was introduced in November 2005. This system is currently incompatible with a Pay on Exit system.
37. At present a customer paying by mobile phone can pay by credit or debit card and has the ability to set a reminder to advise when paid for parking is about to run out and to 'top up' payment from wherever they happen to be at the time the reminder is received. Regular users also have the ability to simply park their vehicle and go.
38. Officers have reviewed the contents of the 2005 report and, apart from the magnitude of the costs reported at that time, are content that the advice given then is still valid. Members' advice is requested if they wish further work to be undertaken with a possible trial on one of the car parks that will identify the practicalities of introducing the proposal.
39. If such a trial were to be undertaken the summary of issues that would need to be overcome are:
  - Incompatibility with Pay by Mobile Phone
  - Difficulties of allowing free disabled parking
  - Difficulties of allowing 'Minster Badge' discount
  - High capital costs of installing barriers and new ticket machines
  - Uncertainties over impact on revenue income

## **Permits**

40. Each specific permit has been introduced to accommodate some real need of the community. There are also some policy issues as the application of any initiative that impacts upon the finance of the Respark system could mean that it would fail to meet the current council policy objective of being self-financing.
41. There can be no doubt that the permit system operated by the council is both extensive and complex. There are 25 different types of permits/season tickets/passes and many have two basic prices, i.e. resident and non-resident or normal vehicle/short (or environmentally friendly) vehicle. In addition there are complexities within the Residents Parking system that mean that there may be different entitlements to permits between adjacent properties within the same zone. Entitlement to permits can also vary



between zones. These considerations and the introduction of differential permit prices can be difficult for both customers and new administrative staff to understand. Appendix E lists all the permits, the number currently issued and their annual cost.

42. Although the permit and charging schedule is extensive it is automated through the parking office software program. Any further changes to the schedule could be accommodated within the program.
43. There has been a request for the current permit discount system to be extended beyond that, which is currently in place, so that any environmentally friendly vehicle may park either on or off street on a pay on the day basis. The delivery of such a policy with the current state of our technology and the level of staff is not possible. Appendix F discusses this issue in more detail from which it will be seen that the annual running costs of the required new payment system would outweigh any additional income effect by around £200k, (based upon an assumed tariff structure).
44. The extension of the current season ticket/respark permit discount would not incur the high levels of costs associated with allowing 'on the day' discounts as both are 'Pay in advance' facilities. However the administrative burden on staff would be considerable due to the extensive checks that would be required, (the same make and model but with different engines may fall into up to three CO2 bands only one of which might qualify for a discount). The current establishment would need to be increased so as to maintain service to other customers. There is a further complication in that such a discount could not be granted to applicants for Household Respark permits as these are not vehicle specific.
45. Until the DVLA database is sufficiently reliable and comprehensive in relation to the banding of all vehicles, the introduction of a charge based upon the vehicle's CO2 band is not recommended at this time.

### **Respark**

46. The present structure of the Respark system has been in place now since 1993 when charges for permits were introduced, (the scheme commenced in 1987 free of charge). The Policy objective (self financing) was adopted at that time. Then, as now the vast majority of quarterly or annual permits were issued at the 'Householder' level. This type of permit is the most flexible for a resident as it is not vehicle specific. The sale of this type of permit therefore very largely accounts for the bulk of the income from permits. Any small change in the charge made for a household permit therefore immediately impacts disproportionately on the overall income. Conversely large changes in the cost of other permits have limited impacts.
47. Officers understand that there is a desire to reduce the cost of the household permit. To achieve this there will need to be a change to the policy made in 1993.

48. Appendix G provides a table for comparison purposes if the household permits are halved in price. It will be seen that the halving of the current annual charge for the Household and additional permits would require a subsidy of some £174k pa from the Parking account (or the council tax). It will also be seen that just halving the Household permit charge but maintaining all other charges as now would still result in a need for a £133k pa subsidy. Either approach therefore would mean that the amount of money available to the council for the delivery of other services would be reduced unless the council tax were to be increased or balancing savings made elsewhere.
49. Further information that compares resident parking charges around the country is included in Appendix H. It can be seen from the table that York's charges are significantly higher than most of the authorities shown apart from those in the London area.

### **Changes in Car Park Charges**

50. Increasing the charges for car parking could potentially generate additional income but the impact of any increase would depend on the level of increase as any significant increase would result in a reduction in usage that may offset any additional income.
51. Appendix I provides a comparison of parking charges with other similar and neighbouring authorities and the private sector providers in York. It can be seen that for shorter stay periods the car park charges are moderately more expensive whereas longer stay periods are more similar to other authorities. Standard stay car parks compare favourably with the private sector providers. Foss Bank car park provides exceptionally good value for money when compared with others.
52. The potential changes to car park charges should be considered through the annual budget process taking into account impact on all the various factors affected.

### **Raising public awareness of the Parking Service**

53. Changes to government regulations on the operation of decriminalised parking will shortly make the publication of an annual report mandatory. Appendix J contains the draft Annual Report for 2006/07. Because of its size this is only available via the Intranet but a hard copy has been made available in the Members Library for inspection.
54. Appendix K contains the draft Protocols to be used when undertaking enforcement (these are the protocols that are in fact in actual use now). Appendix L contains the draft Protocols to be used by Administration staff when assessing objections against the issue of a PCN; these are the protocols that are in use now. Both documents are also only available via the Intranet but again copies have been deposited in the Members Library for inspection.

55. If these are adopted by Members as statements of council policy it is recommended that the annual report and protocols be published on the council's web site so as to inform customers of the way the service operates and will respond to any given situation.
56. Appendix M (again only available via the Intranet but on deposit in the Members Library) is a document, which sets out the level of service that Parking Services is funded to deliver. This for the first time provides clear information about patrol frequencies relative to different types of restrictions, etc.

## **CONSULTATION**

57. There has been limited consultation of the review with the trade unions and staff. If the recommendations are approved then there would be a need to discuss the issues, particularly in relation to any future arrangements for the enforcement team, with the trade unions and staff.

## **CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

58. Parking Services contribute to the corporate priority to increase the use of public and other environmentally friendly modes of transport. The use of car parking as a demand management tool within an overall package of measures that discourages the use of the car and encourages the use of public and other modes of transport.

## **IMPLICATIONS**

### **Financial**

59. The gross budgeted income to City of York Council from its parking account is £7,810k for 2007/08. After taking into account expenditure the net income to the council is £3,989k. This is of significant benefit to the council since it effectively reduces the level of council tax (c.8%) that needs to be raised. The income levels however are dependant on a large number of variables such as price, supply, economic conditions and attractiveness of alternative transport provision.
60. Small changes that are made to the parking fees and tariffs can therefore have a significant impact on the council's overall budget. The impact on income in most cases can only be guides and can not be classed as definitive.
61. Members are also aware that the medium term financial forecast shows that a significant level of savings are going to have to be made across the council in 2008/09. It is recommended therefore that any changes sought by members is fully costed and evaluated and considered as part of the budget process before being implemented from the new financial year.

## **Human Resources (HR)**

62. If the recommendation to review the local agreement and the delivery of enforcement is approved then there will be staffing implications in respect of consultation with the trade unions and the staff.
63. The HR implications of any further initiatives brought forward to subsequent meetings will be identified within the appropriate report.

## **Other - Internal Audit**

64. The officer response made in respect of the Financial Review is supported.

## **Other Implications**

65. There are no Equalities, Legal, Crime and Disorder, Information Technology, or Property implications.

## **RISK MANAGEMENT**

66. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy the main risks that have been identified in this report are those which could lead to the inability to meet business objectives (Strategic) and to deliver services (Operational), leading to financial loss (Financial). Measured in terms of impact and likelihood, the risk score all risks has been assessed at less than 16, This means that at this point the risks need only to be monitored as they do not provide a real threat to the achievement of the objectives of this report.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

67. It is recommended that:
  - a. The recommendations in respect of the financial and functional review be adopted as paragraph 22 and Appendix C.
  - b. The revised parking policy as suggested in paragraph 24 is adopted.
  - c. There is consultation with the trade unions and staff on the local agreement to improve performance and flexibility.
  - d. The provision of the enforcement service is reviewed and alternatives considered which will be reported to the Executive in the New Year.
  - e. That Appendix D is noted with respect to Pay on Exit and advice is given on whether further work should be undertaken.
  - f. No change is made, at this time, to the permit discount scheme for environmentally friendly vehicles both for on and off street parking.
  - g. No change is made in the charge for a household parking permit in accordance with current policy.

- h. No change is made in the current level of car parking charges but that this is considered through the annual budget process.
- i. An Annual Parking Report is published as proposed in Appendix J.
- j. The draft protocols for enforcement (Appendix K) and administration (Appendix L) are adopted.
- k. Service Levels (Appendix M) for Parking Services are adopted.

Reason: For the more efficient and effective management of Parking Services.

## Contact Details

### Author:

Damon Copperthwaite  
Assistant Director City  
Development and Transport  
Tel No (55) Ext No 1448

### Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Bill Woolley  
Director of City Strategy

Report Approved

Date

### Specialist Implications Officers:

Finance – Patrick Looker  
HR – Janet Neeve

### Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

### Background Papers:

Internal Audit Report into Parking Services  
Report by Alpha Parking – City of York: Review of Parking

## Appendices

- A. Progress to date with implementation of changes
- B. Key information
- C. Review recommendations and responses
- D. Extract from earlier report on the Pay on Exit system
- E. Schedule of Permits
- F. Overview of issues concerning the introduction of Environmentally Friendly vehicle discounts
- G. Comparison of various Respark permit charging structures and income produced
- H. Comparison of Resident Permit Charges
- I. Comparison of Parking charges with those charged in neighbouring towns and cities
- J. Draft Annual Parking report
- K. Draft Enforcement Protocols
- L. Draft Administration Protocols
- M. Draft Parking Services, service specification.

*[Note – Appendices J-M are available for inspection in the Members' Library and at Guildhall Reception or online at [www.york.gov.uk](http://www.york.gov.uk)]*



**Progress to date with implementation of changes recommended by the reviews.**

<b>Review subject</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Action</b>
Daytime parking charges		
	The ability to pay by credit or debit card should be made available	Pay by phone has been introduced into most off street car parks. This allows payment by credit or debit card and customers do not need to pre register. The system has an alert facility to warn when paid for parking is about to expire and the facility to purchase more parking irrespective of the customers actual location at the time of reminder.
	Options should be made available for a limited number of customers wishing to stay for long periods in the city centre to be able to do so without having to pay punitive charges	Foss bank car park has been converted into an all day parking site with parking charges fixed at a reduced flat rate of 70p per hour with no maximum stay. The ability has been offered to Pay by Phone customers to purchase weekly parking at a discount rate, which allows unlimited stays in selected car parks.
	Options should be made available for customers wishing to park on street on Sunday mornings to do so at reduced rates	A Frequent User permit has been introduced which allows on street parking without further payment up to 12 noon on a Sunday
	Charities having their normal base of operation within the city	Under certain criteria city centre charities can now have a limited

	centre should have discounted or free parking	amount of free parking
Evening Parking charges		
	Additional on street parking should be made available	An additional 80 parking spaces have been introduced in and close to the city centre
	Parking charges should be reduced for all users and discounts made available for regular users	<p>The previous hourly payments system has been replaced by a flat rate fee, which covers any duration of stay after 6pm.</p> <p>The Frequent User permit system has been extended so as to cover evening parking and provides a substantial discount for regular users. This permit also allows parking in off street parking areas from 5pm until 8.30am the following day.</p> <p>Evening Parking for Minster Badge holders was made free from 30 July 2007.</p>



## Background to the Service and Key Information

### On and Off Street Parking

Table 1 below gives the current and historic number of spaces by car park operated by the Council relative to when decriminalised parking enforcement was introduced.

**Table 1**

Car park	Number of spaces	
	2000	2006
<a href="#">Foss Bank</a>	338	316
<a href="#">Esplanade</a>	163	75
<a href="#">Marygate</a>	376	352
<a href="#">St Georges</a>	443	443
<a href="#">Union Terrace</a>	246	216
<a href="#">Nunnery Lane</a>	200	193
<a href="#">Bootham</a>	100	100
<a href="#">Shambles</a>	275	269*
<a href="#">Haymarket</a>	110	102*
<a href="#">Kent Street</a>	374	374*
<a href="#">Monkbar</a>	247	243
<a href="#">Castle</a>	320	318
<a href="#">Piccadilly</a>	290	287
<a href="#">Peel Street</a>	77	77#
<a href="#">Castle Mills</a>	73	73#
Heworth Green	400	0
Toft Green	57	0
Tanner Row	255	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4344</b>	<b>3438</b>

\* Reductions in parking capacity in 2008

# Close between 2008 and 2011

Table 2 gives the total length of controlled on street restrictions in 2006/07

**Table 2**

Respark	(m)
Length of 10 minute bays	19,939
Length of 30 minute bays	176
Length of 60 minute bays	5,464
Length of 120 minute bays	898
Length of prohibited waiting	73,241
<b>Totals</b>	<b>99,719</b>
<b>Other</b>	
Length of prohibited waiting	167,083

	Length of Pay & Display bays	823
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>167,906</b>

**Grand totals** **267,626**

Table 3 gives the total number of permits issued in 2006/07

**Table 3**

Respark		
	Household and other	5,526
	Visitor	155,000
Other		
	Car parks	250

### **Management and Enforcement**

During 2006/7, 24 Parking Attendants were deployed with an average presence of 5.8 officers on duty at any one time. In addition 3 car park attendants were employed to provide a permanent presence in Shambles car park (due to its Pay on Exit system) and 4 cash collectors were in post. A total of 23,418 Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) were issued, 15,004 on-street and 8,414 in car parks. Both volumes of PCN's were down on those in 2005/6. There has been a national downward trend in the numbers of PCN's, particularly in councils that have been enforcing on-street waiting restrictions for some years, which suggests that greater compliance with regulations is beginning to be experienced. Table 4 below gives the PCN volumes over the past three full years.

**Table 4 – PCN issued by year**

	<b>2004/5</b>	<b>2005/6</b>	<b>2006/7</b>
On Street issue	16,261	17,765*	15,004
Off Street issue	12,497	10,702	8,414
<b>Total</b>	<b>28,758</b>	<b>28,467</b>	<b>23,418</b>

\*distorted by additional numbers issued due to temporary city centre events

In 2006/7 approximately 33% of the Enforcement patrol activity was connected with off street car parks, 44% was spent within areas covered by the Respark scheme and the balance of 23% was spent enforcing on street regulations. The balance between the enforcement of off street and on street regulations was adjusted during the year so as to concentrate greater effort on to the on street regulations. The proportion of time devoted to Respark, however remained similar to that in previous years.

In the year 2006/07 the council dealt with a total of 6,954 objections and 2,349 representations. This meant that over 30% of all PCN's issued resulted in some form of a challenge. An objection is an informal challenge that is made shortly after a PCN has been issued and a representation is a formal legal challenge that is made following the issue of a document known as a 'Notice to Owner' to the registered

keeper of the vehicle. A motorist who receives a PCN may challenge it informally at the objection stage of the procedure and, if the objection is dismissed, formally at the representation stage, which is also dealt with by the council but by a different officer from the one who dealt with the initial objection. If the representation is also rejected the motorist may then appeal to an independent adjudicator. A representation usually results from the rejection of an initial objection but this is not always the case and about a quarter of representations are made without any previous correspondence having been received. On average each objection generated just under 2.5 items of correspondence between the customer and the council.

The issuing of permits and the management of the objection process is undertaken by ten staff four of whom work part time, resulting in some 8.3 full time equivalent posts. Approximately 4.5 full time equivalents are occupied on the administration of permits, the remaining 3.8 deal with objections. In addition to these posts three staff (whose working hours result in the equivalent of 2.8 full time posts) work in managing the formal representations made against the issue of a PCN and the handling of the process whereby motorists can appeal to an independent parking adjudicator. This team also deal with the recovery of unpaid, but still valid, PCN's.

### **Income and Expenditure**

Table 5 below gives the details of the budgeted income and expenditure for 2006/7 and the outturn achieved.

**Table 5**

<b>INCOME (Gross)</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Outturn</b>
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Residents Parking	-559	-580
Short Stay Car Parks	-2,042	-2,122
Standard Stay Car Parks	-3,782	-3,854
Coach Parks	-44	-41
Penalty Charges	-763	-659
On Street	-475	-513
Season Tickets & Passes	-140	-121
Other Services	-14	-16
<b>Total</b>	<b>-7,819</b>	<b>-7,906</b>

<b>EXPENDITURE (Gross)</b>		
Enforcement	840	816
Administration	671	655
Security	288	274
Car Park Expenditure	2,270	2,224
Respark New Schemes	13	12
Respark	19	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,101</b>	<b>3,995</b>
<b>Balance to council fund</b>	<b>-3,718</b>	<b>-3,911</b>

The balance to the council fund (of £3,911k) was £193k (or 5.19%) higher than budgeted. This balance as is required by law, was used to deliver transport related services. Whilst there is no direct financial connection as such (as in reality the balance effectively means that income does not have to be raised from elsewhere – such as the council tax) the vast majority of this was spent on supporting public transport within the city. To replace the net income received as a result of the parking trading account the council tax for the city would need to increase by some 8%.

Typically the transport related services are support for concessionary travel scheme, transport for the disabled, shopmobility, social bus services, park and ride, and road safety.

In terms of the three 'trading' accounts the 2006/7 outturn is given in Table 7:

**Table 7 trading account outturns 2006/7**

**Respark**

	£'000
<b>Expenditure</b>	
Enforcement costs	£359
PCN administration costs	£313
Respark new schemes	£12
Respark	£14
<b>Total</b>	<b>£698</b>
<b>Income</b>	
PCN's	-£119
Permits	-£580
<b>Total</b>	<b>-£699</b>
<b>Profit/loss</b>	<b>-£1</b>

	£'000
<b><u>Enforcement</u></b>	
<b>Expenditure</b>	
Enforcement costs	£457
PCN administration costs	£341
<b>Total</b>	<b>£799</b>
<b>Income</b>	
PCN's	-£539
Permits	£0
<b>Total</b>	<b>-£539</b>
<b>Profit/loss</b>	<b>£260</b>

### **Parking**

	<b>£'000</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>	
Security	£274
Car Park Expenditure	£2,223
<b>Total</b>	<b>£2,497</b>
<b>Income</b>	
Short Stay Car Parks	-£2,122
Standard Stay Car Parks	-£3,854
Coach Parks	-£41
On Street	-£513
Season Tickets & Passes	-£121
Other Services	-£15
<b>Total</b>	<b>-£6,666</b>
<b>Profit/loss</b>	<b>-£4,169</b>

It can be seen from the table that the enforcement service was subsidised by the parking operation to the value of £260k in 2006/7. The respark service effectively broke even – as is required by a Policy established by Council in 1993.



## Review Recommendations and Response

Ref	Recommendation	Officer response
F1	Management should consider how the service could be re-organised so as to separate income collection and the administration of penalty charges.	<p>With current staffing levels and working practices this will prove to be very difficult. Given that budget considerations preclude the employment of more staff the only option is to reduce the workload on existing staff. This can only come from a review of the way the permits are administered.</p> <p>It is <b>recommended</b> that such a review be undertaken to identify if staffing resources can be released to allow the separation of income collection and administration of penalty charges.</p>
F2	Systems for receipt of postal payments should be reviewed and updated. There should be a secure trail from receipt of post to processing of payments. This is likely to include provision for secure receipt of post and post collection by at least two staff members.	<p>Again staffing resources in the Departmental Post Room are inadequate to allow this recommendation to be adopted without a reduction in current duties.</p> <p>It is <b>recommended</b> that action on implementing this recommendation be deferred pending the outcome of the review above as it may prove viable for the whole of the post handling arrangement to be managed by Parking Services</p>
F3	Parking Services should liaise with the Departmental Finance Team to identify how reconciliation of income postings to the Parking Office system and FMS can be achieved.	Implementation of this recommendation is in hand
F4	The ability to write off penalty charge debts on the Parking Office system should be restricted. Staff with access to this function should have no involvement in cash collection	<p>Whilst there is a clear link with this recommendation and that concerning F1, it has proved possible to introduce a simple arrangement whereby the original processing officer has his/her reasons for cancellation reviewed by another officer prior to the cancellation decision being confirmed.</p> <p>In response to this financial observation a system of secondary approval has therefore been introduced so that any</p>

		decision to cancel a PCN is accepted by two officers
F5	Prior to processing, the schedule of debts to be written off should be authorised by the Head of Financial Services. A senior officer within Parking services should periodically check that the total numbers and value of debts written off match those authorised for write off.	Records are sent to the Director of Resources for formal writing off.
F6	Procedures for the review and, where appropriate, the authorisation of cancelled PCNs should be updated. There should be adequate supervision of staff to ensure that only valid cancellations are input and that policies are applied consistently. This should include regular monitoring of numbers of cancellations processed by category and staff member.	Implementation of this recommendation has been completed
F7	Car park ticket machine audit tickets should not be destroyed. Instead, the tickets should be forwarded to a nominated officer who should be given responsibility for reconciling the tickets to banked income. This officer should have no involvement in the collection or counting of ticket machine income.	The volume of tickets is such that this recommendation is impractical with the current levels of staff. A new computer system is, however, on order that will be able to provide suitable electronic records, which could be used, should it be required to undertake spot checks. This is anticipated to be installed by the early part of the summer
F8	<p>Controls over parking permits should be reviewed. Systems should be put in place to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• store all permit templates securely and restrict access to them</li> <li>• record serial numbers for templates delivered, permits issued, and spoilt permits</li> <li>• periodically reconcile permit templates in hand to expected numbers, based on the records</li> </ul> <p>Consideration should be given to setting up a system that will enable valid permits to be identified immediately by parking attendants. For example by the use of permit numbers with check sums or providing searchable lists of currently valid permits, in electronic</p>	<p>The recommendation concerning the management of permit blanks has been implemented.</p> <p>Officers are investigating how to introduce a workable system, such as bar codes, to check valid permits as suggested.</p> <p>It is <b>recommended</b> that the work on progressing implementation of this recommendation be continued.</p>



	format.	
F9	Management information requirements should be reviewed and systems put in place to monitor and control actual performance.	Implementation of this recommendation is in hand



### **Conversion of the Pay and Display off street car parking charging system to Pay on Exit**

Extract from Report to The Executive “Alternative methods of payment for parking” dated 26 September 2005

27. The council currently operates a system, which requires a customer to anticipate how long they intend to park and to pay accordingly. With high tariffs the implications of not overstaying an estimated time of stay are significant and thus customers try to more carefully estimate how long they will be. Invariably many get this wrong and overstay (6083 customers in 2003). The low number of Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's) cancelled (672) indicate that acceptable reasons for overstay are few, further indicating that the system generates a body of individuals who then have a poor view of the city and Parking Service.
28. The key to improving this situation is to charge for the time actually used in the same manner as charges are made for the use of electricity, and gas. This clearly requires knowledge of when the parking action commences and terminates together with a mechanism for ensuring that payment is made. Having such a system opens up the possibility of being able to charge by the minute and not in large steps. The charging structure could be arranged so as to still discourage long stay parking but any poor estimation of a return time would not have such significant financial consequences for the driver.
29. Such a system is commonly described as ‘Pay on Exit’ and two such are in use now within city council car parks, one at Shambles and one at the Monks Cross Park and Ride site. In both the customer drives to an entry barrier where upon taking a ticket the barrier rises and allows the vehicle into the car park. The driver then parks as normal and leaves the car park. Upon return the driver inserts the ticket into a pay station, which calculates the amount of payment due. Following the receipt of payment the ticket is then reissued to the driver who then has a certain period of time to get to his/her vehicle and proceed to the exit barrier. At the barrier the ticket is inserted into a ticket reader, which opens the barrier to allow the vehicle to proceed.
30. The advantages and disadvantages of such a system are: -

Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>Would eliminate the need for enforcement staff to patrol these car parks therefore a reduction in staffing costs should be possible</p> <p>Eliminates PCN for overstaying pre-paid time in existing car parks.</p> <p>Customers don't need to decide how long they are going to be parked before they leave their car.</p> <p>Customers can extend their stay (to spend more money in City Centre) by paying for additional time when they return to the car</p> <p>Charges can be applied in a flexible way</p> <p>Would automatically allow longer stays than currently permitted (just pay more)</p> <p>Would allow retailer discount scheme to go ahead without any ongoing costs</p>	<p>Capital cost</p> <p>Reduction in PCN income</p> <p>Possibly a reduction in ticket machine income.</p> <p>Cannot be applied to all car parks as Bootham Row not a suitable configuration.</p> <p>Cannot be applied on street</p> <p>Would not recognise current season tickets, contract passes and frequent users evening passes. These would need to be re-launched with a card / token for access through the barrier</p> <p>Would be difficult to provide free parking for blue badge disabled parking and discounts for short vehicles.</p> <p>Staff would have to be able to respond quickly to equipment breakdowns / lost tickets etc as customers would be trapped on the car park</p> <p>At busy times the delay in getting through the barrier and into the car park could lead to queues forming which in turn could interfere with traffic flow on the main road</p>

31. Early versions of this system (as is that at Shambles) were prone to regular difficulties due to loss of or damage to the paper tickets. Modern systems

(such as that at Monks Cross) use a plastic token which is less likely to get lost and robust enough to withstand normal wear and tear whilst in the possession of the customer. The tokens are reusable.

32. Allowing free parking for the Disabled in Pay on Exit car parks is not as simple as for Pay and Display sites. Some unique form of identification that is recognisable by the electronic equipment is necessary. This requires the customer to obtain a 'discount card', which is inserted at the pay station at the time that payment is requested. A similar system is also required to allow Minster Badge holders to obtain reduced rate parking.
33. Detailed investigation into the introduction of such a Pay on Exit system has now been undertaken with the following conclusions: -
- these systems require a high degree of maintenance – higher than the current Pay and Display machines
  - installation of a suitable system in York – which could not cover all our car parks – would cost in the region of £900k
  - savings in the number of patrol staff required would be limited: -
- (a) as staff currently integrate off street enforcement with on street (i.e. yellow line and Respark)
- (b) off street patrols would still be required to cover Bootham Row, Bishopthorpe Road and East Parade
- extra maintenance staff would be required to deal with the additional maintenance load and these staff would need to work so as to cover 7 days a week rather than as now for Pay and Display machines, only Monday to Friday.
  - if current arrangements are to continue, operation of a Minster badge system would require all holders to replace their badges with an electronically readable version at a significant overall cost to the council – if that cost were not to be passed on to residents.
  - again if current arrangements are to continue Disabled customers would need to obtain an electronically readable permit in advance of parking to enable them to enjoy free parking. This would effectively act as a disincentive to our disabled visitors and project an unwelcoming image of the city. Consideration would have to be given to how the considerable year on year cost of funding such a permit could be met. Clearly requiring a Disabled customer to pay for a permit to obtain free parking is in effect requiring them to pay for parking via another means (albeit at a substantial discount). Issues over our advertising free parking for the disabled in relation to Trading Standards laws would need to be resolved.

- there is no reliable evidence to indicate if the use of such a system would increase or reduce income. The risk to the council's revenue stream is thus uncertain.

## Pay on Exit Financial Implications

34. Table 3 below gives a comparison of revenue operating costs for a Pay on Exit system as compared to the current Pay and Display system

Table 3

Activity	Cost change
Staffing	
Maintenance of machines	£54k
Patrol Staff	-£83k
Administration	-£19k
Machines	
Consumables	Nil
Hardware, Electricity and Communications	£24k
Permits for Discounts	
For the Disabled	See Note 1
For Minster Badge Holders	See Note 2
Total	-£24k

Notes:

- 1 – Permits for the Disabled – to supply these free of charge would cost £42k every three years (£14k pa). Alternatively the individual concerned could lease them for the sum of £1 per month
- 2 – Minster badges – to supply these free of charge would cost around £120k every three years (£40k pa) Alternatively they could be leased for the sum of £1 per month by the individual concerned

35. The income consequences of introducing a Pay on Exit system depends upon the following factors:

- Any change in the duration of stay
- Any attraction of new customers as a result of the ability to pay by credit/debit cards and or pay by notes with change given
- The proportion of customers paying by cash or by credit/debit card

On the basis that all existing customers are retained, new customers are not generated as a result of the introduction of the system, the duration of paid for parking does not either increase or decrease and 5% of customers pay by credit/debit card.

Taking all the above factors into account a Pay on Exit system is likely to have an income effect (as compared to a Pay and Display system) as follows: -

Table 4 possible overall income effect of a Pay on Exit system

Effect	Change
Operational changes (Table 3)	-£24k
Annual effect of free disabled persons permits	£14k
Loss Of PCN Income	£200k
Overall impact	£190k

NB – The above effect could be worse if customers stay for less time than they do now. There would be a loss of income arising as a consequence of the difference between the unused but pre paid period (for which CyC would now have the income) and the actual time paid for as used.

36. In terms of Capital implications a sum of approximately £900k would have to be found. The repayments on borrowing of this sum would amount to in the region of £93k pa over a term of 15 years. Repayment of this borrowing from increased income would thus not be possible. Members will therefore appreciate that from a purely financial revenue point of view the introduction of this system is not viable.

#### Pay on Exit Recommendations

37. It is recommended that: -
- no action be taken at this time to further progress the introduction of a Pay on Exit system





## Appendix E

### Schedule of Permits

Name of Permit	Explanation of Permit Use	Annual Cost	No of Current Permits	Notes
<b>Residents Parking Schemes</b>				
Authorisation Card	Allows residents to purchase visitor permits.	£2.50	4,782	Free if resident is also buying a household permit or is over 60, disabled, or in receipt of income support or long term incapacity benefit.
Household Permit	For a resident to use on any vehicle.	£88	3,185	
Additional Permit	For a resident to use on a second named vehicle (vehicle specific)	£130	452	
Additional Permit	For a resident to use on a third named vehicle (vehicle specific)	£256	7	
Additional Permit	For a resident to use on a fourth named vehicle (vehicle specific)	£512	0	
Visitor Permits	Purchased by residents and supplied to visitors. Sold in books of 5	£5 a book	155,270	The number of current permits is the total number issued in 2006/07. Discounts for over 60's, disabled and those in receipt of income support or long term incapacity benefit. - Reduced to £1 a book
Special Control Permit	Allows certain residents who live in areas where no parking is available to park in another area. For example, residents of Micklegate may park in R15 bays at Bishophill	£88	49	No entitlement to visitor permits.
HMO Permit	For residents who live in a House of Multiple Occupancy	£126	23	Up to 4 residents may buy one for a property at the same price. HMO permits are only valid in Community Bays.
Landlord Permit	Allows the owner of a property, who is not resident at the property to park for 1 hour in excess of the normal maximum stay.	£126	6	
Business Permit	Can be issued to the owners of business premises within certain resident parking zone.	£315	60	

Name of Permit	Explanation of Permit Use	Annual Cost	No of Current Permits	Notes
Commercial Permit	For a person who in the course of their business is required to visit premises in a resident parking zone.	£438	5	Can buy one for one resident parking zone only for £113
Property Permit	Available to a person who owns an unoccupied property in a resident zone and is engaged in building or renovation work.	£88	1	Daily permit is available at £2 a day.
Guest House Authorisation Card	Allows the proprietors of guesthouses to give guest house permits to their paying guests.	£315	68	The permits are only valid in community or guest house bays
Community Permits	Entitles the holder to visit a resident for the purpose of delivering care or a service	£42	510	Can be purchased as day permits at £20 for a book of 20 - reduced to £4 a book for charities
Attendance Permits	Can be issued to a resident who is in need of care or in receipt of Attendance Allowance or Disability Living Allowance	Nil	81	
Special Additional Permit	Can be supplied to residents who are in receipt of Attendance Allowance or Disability Living Allowance for use on their own vehicle.	Nil	17	
Charity Permit	Allows a charity to have a permit for their staff.	Nil	43	
Low Emission Permits AND Short Vehicle Permits	A discount is allowed of 50% off all permits.  A discount is allowed of 50% off all permits for vehicles that are less than 2.7 metres	50% off  50% off	36	Low Emission is defined as a vehicle that meets the requirements of condition (Band) A or condition (Band) B of the Vehicle Excise and Registration Act 1994.  The number of current permits is a combined figure for low emission and short vehicle permits.

### Other On-Street Permits

Magistrates Permit	Allows a magistrate to park in the designated bays in King's Staith	Nil		Not issued by Parking Services
Police Permit	Allows a police vehicle to park in the designaged bays in King's Staith	Nil		Not issued by Parking Services
Doctors Permit	Allows doctors to park in the designated bays in Driffied Terrace.	£42	12	
Market Trader's Permit	Allows market traders to park in the pay and display bays in Foss Islands Road at a reduced rate.	Nil		Not issued by Parking Services
York Car Club Permit	Allows car club cars to park in the designated bay in Fulford Road	Nil	2	

Name of Permit	Explanation of Permit Use	Annual Cost	No of Current Permits	Notes
----------------	---------------------------	-------------	-----------------------	-------

### Off-Street Permits

Minster Badge	Allows residents a discount in most car parks	Nil	1,493	This is the total provided for the last financial year and not the total number in circulation.
Season Ticket	Allows parking in most car parks at a reduced charge.	£995	122	£100 a month or weekly mobile phone payment of £40
Residents Contract Permit	Allows discounted parking for those residents who live within the central area.	£576	30	A permit for Foss Bank Car Park is £650. The permits can also be purchased monthly for £60 at Foss Bank and £50 for other car parks. Foss Bank is more expensive because it offers secure overnight parking.
Staff Scratchcards	Allows parking in most car parks by staff when on council business.	£65	1,376	Book of 20 cards.
Staff Essential User Permit	Allows parking in most car parks by staff who need to use a car most working days when on council business.	£500	49	
Frequent User Permit (Non-Resident)	Allows a reduction for parking between 5pm and 8:30am and 8:30am - 12:30pm on Sundays	£120	5	Can also be bought quarterly for £40
Frequent User Permit (York Resident)	Allows a reduction for parking between 5pm and 8:30am and 8:30am - 12:30pm on Sundays	£84	42	Can also be bought quarterly for £21
York Car Club Permit	Allows parking for car club cars in designated bays in some car parks	Nil	9	
Low Emission Permits AND Short Vehicle Permits	A discount is allowed of 50% off all permits. A discount is allowed of 50% off all permits for vehicles that are less than 2.7 metres		5	The number of current permits is a combined figure for low emission and short vehicle permits.



## Environmental Parking Discounts

### Pollution Bands

The Government have established 7 Excise duty tax bands for vehicles powered by different sources of fuel based upon the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions produced by the engine. Bands A to F only apply to vehicles first registered on or after 1 March 2001. Band G only applies to vehicles first registered on or after 23 March 2006. Vehicles first registered prior to March 2001 are considered separately for Excise duty purposes and this is not based upon any consideration of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

For vehicles first registered on or after 1 March 2001 the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are recorded on the Vehicle Registration documents. This information is also available via interrogation of a central database.

Obtaining information about the volume of vehicles within each Band has proved very difficult but the following table appears to be the most reliable.

Table 1

TOTAL	Great Britain			
	2002	2003	2004	2005
	'000	'000	'000	'000
All Cars with CO <sub>2</sub> band	25,782	26,240	27,028	27,520
Band A	N/A	<1	<1	>1
Band B	60	129	205	277
Band C	1,148	1,873	2,625	3,324
Band D	1,130	1,646	2,189	2,757
Band E	890	1,329	1,753	2,145
Band F	1,411	2,069	2,673	2,079
unavailable	21,143	19,194	17,583	15,797

Source DfT

### Scope for offering differential parking charges based upon Pollution Bands

Unfortunately the totals in the bands together with the 'unavailable' category (taken to be vehicles registered pre March 2001) do not sum to the total number of registered vehicles. For 2005 for example there are 1,142k vehicles unaccounted for. On the basis that these plus the 'unavailable' category are not within the scope of the Governments Vehicle Tax Band system only 38.45% of the vehicles using the roads of the UK come within that scope.

There is no reason to suppose that the mix of vehicles using the roads of York have any different composition to those nationally and thus the application of such a differential tariff would only impact upon 38.45 % of our current users.

### **Tariff structure**

Taking into account the fact that 61.55% of vehicles cannot be offered a differential parking tariff the city potentially has 8 basic tariff bands (A to G plus the unallocated CO2 category). Assuming that the Council wish to continue with offering a Residents discount the number of tariff bands would be 16. Currently the council operates with two basic tariff bands (Residents and others).

Each tariff band contains 7 pricing levels (1hour, 2 hour, etc). Adoption of a fully flexible tariff structure with residents' discounts would mean that there would be 16 x 7 = 112 different payment rates. (currently 14).

The council's Pay and Display ticket machines now operate at the limit of their payment rates and could not accommodate even one single additional payment option. The machines that the council operates have the highest number of payment rates of any Pay and Display machine manufactured.

The present tariff structure requires a quite complex tariff board at the point of sale and the customer to perform a simple manual task if wishing to obtain the Residents discount. Complaints about the confusing nature of the tariff board are very regular and customers on a daily basis fail to obtain the correct tariff for their status either resulting in a Penalty Charge Notice or a complaint.

### **Charging regime**

In order to estimate the potential income effects some assumptions are necessary. Table 2 below gives the actual percentages of vehicles in each charging band and an officer assumed premium to be paid by vehicles in that band relative to the standard pricing structure.

Table 2

			Effective impact	
		Premium of	relative to	
		standard	standard	
		pricing	pricing	
		structure	structure	
A	0.001%	0.5	0.001%	
B	1.006%	0.5	0.503%	
C	12.077%	1	12.077%	
D	10.017%	1.25	12.522%	
E	7.794%	1.5	11.690%	
F	7.553%	1.5	11.329%	
Unbanded	61.552%	1	61.552%	

Based upon this structure the up rate relative to the standard pricing structure would be 109.674%.

### **Impact upon Income**

An income of £6,489k was achieved from car parking and on street ticket sales in 2006/7. Were the above structure to be in place the income would have increased by £628k assuming no price resistance. Undoubtedly there would be price resistance and based upon 10% less band C vehicles using the parking facilities and C and 15% less Bands D and E vehicles this theoretical income would become £322k.

### **Impact upon Expenditure**

#### Capital

As mentioned above the Pay and Display Machines would be incapable of accommodating any further complication of the tariff structure. An entirely new ticket purchasing system would thus have to be sourced and installed. Given the complexity of the tariff (even a simple version combining different CO2 bands and charging residents/others the same) the only solution would be to move to an automatic ticket vending machine such as commonly found on London Underground stations. The ticket supplied would then need to be displayed in the vehicle to facilitate enforcement. With the use of differential tariffs based upon Vehicle Excise bands Pay and Display is the only system that would permit any effective enforcement.

The introduction of new equipment into Haymarket and Peel Street would not be cost effective (as these are due to close within the near future) and these should be left as standard Pay and Display.

Based upon the installation of new equipment into 13 car parks (11 city centre + East Parade and Bishopthorpe Road) a total of 40 machines would be required. Research appears to indicate that the installed cost of a machine is some £30k meaning that Capital of £1,200k would be required. A further £80k would be needed to cover the replacement of the current tariff boards with a touch screen system to show customers the cost of any option they might be interested in. All equipment would need to be sheltered from the elements adding a further £135k. To pay back the combined capital outlay over 7 years would cost around £330k pa

#### **Revenue**

Enforcement could only be done by knowing that the vehicle concerned was within a particular Vehicle Tax band and (if the Residents discount was allowed for) was driven by a resident. The first information could be obtained either via an examination of the Excise disk or interrogation of DVLC. The second by ensuring the vehicle displayed a Residents badge or interrogation of the councils Minster Badge issue database. Both considerations indicate

an extended use of the Blackberry mobile Internet connection device currently in use. Even with this device enforcement would slow down as a consequence of the more extensive checks. To compensate would require an increase in Parking Attendant establishment of at least 6 posts at an annual cost to the council of £198k.

### **Impact upon Parking Account**

Table 3 gives the anticipated Income and Expenditure situation post introduction.

Table 3

Income		Expenditure	
Additional car park income	£322k	Capital repayments	£330k
		Enforcement	£198k
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£322k</b>		<b>£528k</b>

Overall impact – Annual LOSS of £206k



## Appendix G

### Financial Impact of different Respark Permit Charges

■ indicates that the charge has been changed from that in use in 2007/8

		2007/08	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
<b>SERVICE</b>		Actual Charge	Proposed Charge	Proposed Charge	Proposed Charge	Proposed Charge
		£	£	£	£	£
Special Control Permit		88.00	44.00	88.00	44.00	0.00
	Quarterly charge	27.25	13.60	27.25	13.60	0.00
Special Additional Permit		88.00	44.00	88.00	44.00	0.00
	Quarterly charge	27.25	13.60	27.25	13.60	0.00
Business Permit		315.00	315.00	315.00	315.00	315.00
Guest House Authorisation Card		315.00	315.00	315.00	315.00	315.00
Multiple Occupancy Permit		126.00	126.00	126.00	126.00	126.00
Landlord's Permit		126.00	126.00	126.00	126.00	0.00
Household Permit	-Standard	88.00	44.00	44.00	44.00	44.00
	Quarterly charge	27.25	13.60	13.60	13.60	13.60
	-Second	130.00	65.00	130.00	130.00	130.00
	Quarterly charge	42.00	21.00	42.00	42.00	42.00
	-Third	256.00	128.00	256.00	256.00	256.00
	Quarterly charge	69.25	34.60	69.25	69.25	69.25
	-Fourth	512.00	256.00	512.00	512.00	512.00
	Quarterly charge	134.50	67.25	134.50	134.50	134.50
Visitor	-Standard	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	-Concessionary	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
Doctors Permit		42.00	42.00	42.00	42.00	42.00
Discretionary (R37) Permit		42.00	42.00	42.00	42.00	0.00
Day use R37 Permit	- Standard	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	- Charities	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
Authorisation Card without Permit		2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Property Renovation Permit	- Quarterly	88.00	88.00	88.00	88.00	0.00
	- Daily	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.10	0.00
Commercial Permit		438.00	438.00	438.00	438.00	0.00

Commercial Permit (Specific Zone)	113.00	113.00	113.00	113.00	0.00
Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) Full	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00
PCN Discounted	30.00	30.00	30.00	30.00	30.00
PCN Enforced	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00
Admin Fee	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Replacement Permit - Standard	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00
- Concessionary	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00
Immobilisation Release Charge	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00
Vehicle Removal Charge	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00
Vehicle Storage Charge Daily	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00
Vehicle Disposal Charge	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
Admin Fee	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Replacement Permit Respark First Replacement					
Second Replacement	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00
- Concessionary	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00
Replacement Minster Badge First Replacement	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Second Replacement	5	5	5	5	5
<b>Total Income expected</b>	<b>£559,000</b>	<b>£385,000</b>	<b>£426,000</b>	<b>£424,000</b>	<b>£385,000</b>
<b>LOSS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>£174,000</b>	<b>£133,000</b>	<b>£135,000</b>	<b>£174,000</b>

## Appendix H

### Resident Permit Charges

Authority	Annual Cost	Second permit	Visitors	Business	Notes
Ashford	£40.00				£40 in Zone B. Permits in Zone A cost £100.
Aylesbury Vale	£25.00				
Basingstoke & Deane	£22.00		£0.00		£25 in Whitchurch
Bath	£55.00	£75.00	20p/day		£60 in central zone.
Bedford	£15.00	£50.00			3rd permit costs £70.
Birmingham	£15.00	£30.00			Business/residents permits in the Gun Quarter cost £125 per annum and £60 in Jewellery Quarter, both for use in P & D bays. Considering significant increases.
Blackburn	£10.00			£35	
Bolton	£30.00		50p/day		
Bournemouth	£50.00	£50.00	£50.00		
Brighton and Hove	£80.00				
Bristol	£50.00				In current CPZ - max 1 per household. In proposed CPZ - 1st permit £50, 2nd £100, max 2 per household. All in P & D bays -no visitor permits, no eligibility of off-street facility available.
Bury	£15.00	£15.00	£0.00		No limit on residents permits (all £15) but only one visitor.
Cumbria	£0.00				County Council policy - applies to Carlisle, Eden, S. Lakeland, Barrow, Copeland & Allerdale.
Dacorum	£25.00	£50.00			
Darlington	£25.00				
Dartford	£0.00				Residents scheme currently being reviewed to extend borough-wide, with a charge.
Dorset	£60.00				
Dover	£30.00		£1/day		Charge is for on street only. A combined on-and off-street permit is available for £50 per annum. Max. 20 visitors per annum.
Edinburgh	£80.00				£160 in central zone.
Glasgow	£50.00				

Authority	Annual Cost	Second permit	Visitors	Business	Notes
Harlow	£17.00	£34.00	50p/day	£4 per day	Third Residents Permit £70 per year. Fourth Residents Permit £140. Commercial Vehicle Residents Permit £250 per year. Special Permits for Local Authority (inc Health) use £10 per year. Visitor Permits for residents £10 per year limited to one per household.
Hastings	£52.00		30p/hour		Cost is for exclusive residents bays. Shared residents bays (also for public use) cost £25 per year
Herefordshire	£25.00		£25.00		One of each type allowed.
High Wycombe (Bucks)	£25.00				
Liverpool	£0.00				
London Borough of Camden	£70.00				Increases up to £145 dependent on vehicle size.
London Borough of Kensington	£115.00				
London Borough of Wandsworth	£75.00				£18.75 for a green vehicle.
London Borough of Westminster	£115.00				If vehicle is under 1200cc price reduces to £80. Eco vehicles are free.
Luton	£19.00			£378	No limit per household.
Manchester	£0.00				
Medway	£15.00				
Neath Port Talbot	£10.00				Review on-going.
Nottingham	£0.00				Under review.
Oldham	£20.00				
Oxfordshire	£0.00				Residents of Henley are charged £65 per annum and Abingdon residents are charged £100 per annum.
Peterborough	£15.00				Each additional permit is £5.
Poole	£30.00				
Portsmouth	£0.00	£25.00			Just been reduced from £25 and £50.
Reading	£0.00	£50.00		£50 & £100	Discounted to £10 for environmentally friendly vehicles.
Salford	£25.00				£50 if off-street facility available.
Salisbury	£25.00				Cost is per permit - max 3 per household
Sandwell	£15.00	£20.00	10p/hour	£50	
Sefton	£0.00				
Shepway	£25.00				
Slough	£16.00	£16.00			
Southend	£30.00				Cost is for annual residents season car park season tickets.

Authority	Annual Cost	Second permit	Visitors	Business	Notes
Stockport	£0.00				An administration fee of £5 is charged each time that a permit is amended.
Stockton-on-Tees	£10.00				
Stoke on Trent	£10.00		£17.00	£25 or £150	Whilst the annual fee is only £10, a £70 joining fee is charged when the permit is initially issued. Maximum of two visitor permits (1st free to OAPs). Business permits £150 if they have off-street parking.
Swale	£30.00				Charge is for on-street only. An off-street residents permit is also available, at certain car parks, for £10.50 per quarter.
Taunton Deane	£30.00		£10.00		
Thanet	£20.00		£2.20/day	£200	Motorcycle permits are £10.
Three Rivers	£40.00	£80.00			
Trafford	£25.00				
Tunbridge Wells	£20.00				
Warrington	£0.00				
Watford	£16.50	£40.00			
Wigan	£10.00				
Winchester	£15.00	£15.00			Inner Area properties entitled to 1 permit and Outer Area properties entitled to 2 permits. Other areas - £30 each for 3rd/4th permits
Wirral	£0.00		£0.00		Replacement visitor permits £30
York	£88.00	£130.00	£5 for a book of 5	£315	3rd permit - £256 and 4th permit- £512. Visitor permits are reduced to £1 a book for over 60's, disabled and those on benefits
<b>Average</b>	<b>£27.91</b>				



## Parking charges in neighbouring towns and cities

	1 Hour	2 Hours	3 Hours	4 Hours	5 Hours	6 Hours	7 hours	8 Hours	Over 8 Hours	Evening Charge
York										
Short Stay	£2	£4	£6	£8	£10					£2
Standard Stay	£1.30	£2.60	£3.90	£5.50	£7	£9.50	£9.50	£9.50	£9.50	£2
Foss Bank	70p	£1.40	£2.10	£2.80	£3.50	£4.20	£4.90	£5.60	£6.30	Car Park Shut
Bridlington	0.70p - 0.90p	£1.40 - £1.80	£2.10 - £2.70	£2.80 - £3.60	£3.50 - £4.50	£4.20 - £5.40	£4.90 - £6.30	£5.60 - £7.20	£6.30 - £8.10	0.70p
Doncaster	0.40p - £1.20	0.80p - £2.40	£1.40 - £3.60	£3.50 - £5.50	£3.50 - £5.50	£3.50 - £5.50	£3.50 - £5.50	£3.50 - £5.50	£3.50 - £5.50	No
Halifax	0.40p - 0.60p	0.80p - £1.20	£1.20 - £1.80	£1.60 - £2.40	£2.00 - £3.00	£2.40 - £3.60	£2.80 - £4.20	£3.20 - £4.80	£3.60 - £5.40	No
Harrogate	0.60p - £1.20	£1.20 - £2.40	£1.80 - £3.60	£2.40 - £4.80	£3.00 - £6.00	£3.60 - £7.20	£4.20 - £8.40	£4.80 - £9.60	£5.40 - £10.80	£1
Huddersfield	0.60p - 0.80p	£1.20 - £1.60	£1.80 - £2.40	£2.40 - £3.20	£2.50	£4.00	£4.00	£4.00	£4.00	No
Hull	£2.20 - £2.30	£2.20 - £2.30	£3.30 - £3.40	£4.30 - £4.90	£4.30 - £4.90	£7.10 - £8.20	£7.10 - £8.20	£7.10 - £8.20	£7.10 - £8.20	No
Leeds	£1.20 - £1.50	£2.40 - £3.00	£3.20 - £4.50	£3.20 - £7.00	£3.20 - £7.00	£6.40 - £7.00	£6.40 - £7.00	£6.40 - £7.00	£6.40 - £7.00	£1
Scarborough	£1.20	£1.50 - £2.20	£3.20 - £3.50	£3.00 - £6.00	£4.00 - £6.00	£4.00 - £6.00	£5.00 - £9.00	£5.00 - £9.00	£5.00 - £9.00	No
Sheffield	£1.20 - £1.40	£2.40 - £2.80	£3.60 - £4.20	£4.80 - £5.60	£6.00 - £7.00	£7.20 - £8.40	£7.20 - £8.40	£7.20 - £8.40	£7.20 - £8.40	No
Oxford	£1.90 - £3.00	£3.00 - £4.70	£4.80 - £7.00	£6.00 - £10.00	£9.70 - £14.30	£9.70 - £14.30	£14.50 - £21.00	£14.50 - £21.00	£18.20 - £25.70	No
Bath	0.80p - £1.20	£1.00 - £2.80	£2.00 - £4.00	£2.00 - £5.00	£3.00 - £7.00	£6.00 - £7.00	£8.00 - £9.50	£8.00 - £9.50	£8.00 - £12.00	No

NCP										
Stonebow	£1.80	£3	£4.50	£4.50	£4.50	£4.50	£4.50	£4.50	£4.50	
Piccadilly	£3	£3	£5.10	£5.10	£6.40	£6.40	£8.50	£8.50	£8.50	£3.90
Tanner Row	£1.40	£2.70	£4	£5	£6.20	£7.20	£7.20	£7.20	£9.50	
Queen Street	£4.90	£4.90	£4.90	£4.90	£7.50	£7.50	£7.50	£7.50	£9	£2
Leeman Road	£1	£2.50	£2.50	£4.50	£4.50	£4.50	£4.50	£4.50	£6	
Q Park										
Kent Street	£3	£3	£3	£3	£3	£3	£3	£3	£3	£3

1. York charges quoted are those applicable to non residents
2. Residents enjoy a 30p per hour discount on day time parking charges and a 50% discount in the evening