

<b>Committee Date / Reference</b>	<b>North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Parking Committee</b>	
	<b>4 October 2012</b>	
<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Pricing of Elements Report 2012</b>	
<b>Report Subject</b>	Setting the scale of fees and charges for on-street items to maintain the Business Case and introducing and discussing kerbside management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking Permits; Kerbside Parking Management (Unpaid/Pay and Display)</li> <li>• Parking Suspensions, Dispensations and other associated charges</li> <li>• Temporary no-waiting cones and associated Orders</li> </ul>	
<b>Reason and Decision being sought</b>	<b>Agree fees and charges for on-street parking 2013/14</b> For good financial control and to maintain parity with the Business Plan	
<b>Type of Report</b>	Parking Financial	
<b>Report Author/ Job Title</b>	Report by Richard Walker Parking Partnership Group Manager	
<b>Author's Contact</b>	01206 282708	richard.walker@colchester.gov.uk
<b>Other Referenced Papers</b>	none	



## **Fees and Charges for the Parking Partnership 2012/2013**

### **1 Summary and Scope**

- 1.1 Fees and charges for on-street operations provide a quarter of the Partnership's on-street income, the rest coming from issued Penalty Charge Notices (PCN).
- 1.2 When the Partnership started, it inherited a wide variety of different pricing structures for on-street parking. The Partnership's Business Case was based on a plan to bring the account out of deficit within two years, a process which includes harmonising and simplifying the pricing structures and finding ways to make the service more efficient. Substantial efficiencies are planned, especially in the way permits are delivered.
- 1.3 At the meetings in June and November 2011, Members were asked to decide the future pricing structure for the Parking Partnership. Members supported the case made in the Business Case and the supporting papers and to close the differential between Resident Parking Permit prices, keeping the Committee informed of progress.
- 1.4 Prices were increased slightly in line with the case in the Business Case and implemented in April/May 2012. A further increase is due leading into 2013 if the Business Case position is to be maintained.
- 1.5 This item is brought to the Committee's attention before final budget setting so that Members can debate the issues locally and if required before the October 4 2012 meeting. This will feed into the December 13 2012 meeting where final budgetary decisions will need to be made.
- 1.6 In order to meet the aims of the Business Case, to take the Partnership operation out of deficit, it is recommended that fees continue to change in line with the Business Case over the course of coming years in order to harmonise the way charging is carried out and schemes are administered.
- 1.7 The different charges currently in operation have been presented at previous meetings. There remains a variation in prices, terms and conditions, which is especially evident in the variety of Resident Parking schemes. These are being addressed by ECC in the Parking Orders.
- 1.8 The Business Case recommended kerb side machine-managed parking (using machines like "pay and display", with an initial/free period depending on locality) in place of some limited-waiting parking to bring combined benefits of policing space turnover (as expiry time is shown on a ticket, not observed) and making best use of CEO time.
- 1.9 Effective enforcement of "limited waiting" parking areas is inefficient. The process to successfully enforce a restriction of this type consumes time and resources with multiple future visits and evidence collection by the Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) whilst giving the motorist ample opportunity to contravene parking restriction and evade penalty.

## Individual Elements

### 2 Kerb Side Machine-Managed Parking

- 2.1 The introduction of kerb side machine-managed parking is recommended and will be investigated alongside other Traffic Engineering issues. An income stream will be a by-product of this kerbside parking management technique, but must be considered alongside the Order-making and objections timescale, and carries a large Order-making overhead cost, thus, as for TRO work, income figures have not been included at this stage.
- 2.2 The Business Case stated that the Partnership would identify suitable areas within the six districts and boroughs for on-street kerb side machine-managed parking to be considered.
- 2.3 This is a process to make more efficient the turn-over of spaces and enforcement in order to assist local traders and the efforts of district councils in supporting vibrancy of local towns. Client Officers have been shown the type of sites where such measures could be implemented and discussions will continue through the TRO process.
- 2.4 It is *not* intended to use kerb side machine-managed parking in the high-street simply to raise income. Income is *not* the main focus; the reason for implementing is for turnover and greater use of spaces, supporting local traders, district council investment in towns, car parks, and efficiency.
- 2.5 There is also a proposal for a temporary relaxation in the policy rules to allow for the implementation of self-supporting Resident Parking schemes where these would be more beneficial and there is a clear majority in the local area calling for such implementation, for example to solve commuter traffic problems.
- 2.6 If any surplus income should be gained as a result this shall firstly enable resident permits to be kept at a reasonable price in future and then be used to offset costs of parking management schemes and maintenance and provision of parking signage or infrastructure.

### 3 Resident Permits

- 3.1 The business case set out that there should be a base price set for all permits. The base price will be set to ensure that operational costs are met to initially implement any new resident parking schemes and the subsequent successful enforcement of the schemes to ensure they are being used as intended.
- 3.2 For existing schemes, a 3-year plan was suggested in order to soften the transition when levelling out the wide disparity in pricing. This is the second of the interim years, and the focus is on closing the disparity between schemes, especially where costs are not covered by the permit fee.

- 3.3 The business case set out a path for the future year's charges in order to meet the business case profile, and this is shown in table 1, below:

<b>Residents' Permits</b>							
First permit charge		Braintree	Colchester	Epping	Harlow	Tendring	Uttlesford
<i>(price table agreed by JPC in 2011)</i>							
Permit charge	09/10	31	50	30	18	39	70
Permit charge	11/12	31	50	30	18	39	70
<b>Permit charge</b>	<b>12/13</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Permit charge</b>	<b>13/14</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>70</b>
Permit charge	14/15	38	60	35	28	45	70
Permit charge	15/16	38	60	35	28	45	70

**Table 1 – Business Case** Proposed Resident Parking Charges 2011-16

- 3.4 It is recommended to continue to even out the charging disparity by making the changes detailed in Table 1, above, in order to keep in line with the Business Case.
- 3.5 There is an ongoing option for an individual borough or district to subsidise the cost of the service in its area if it so chooses. Any concession will require a reimbursement from the borough or district to the Parking Partnership on-street account to meet the full cost.
- 3.6 It was also recommended in the Business Case that all other visitor scratch card, worker and business permits and on-street pay and display charges are subject to at least an annual 3% increase. These price increases will be implemented on or soon after April 1 each year.
- 3.7 Resident and Visitor Permit Parking Prices were last revised starting in April/May 2012 following decisions made by the Joint Committee in 2011.
- 3.8 Resident permits differ between districts in the number allowed to be purchased and in the price charged for permits. Some allow for a second, third and so on, some at a premium – and others have an incremental pricing structure, and in some places a limit is set.
- 3.9 It is recommended that harmonisation be brought about through incremental increases of these other permits, phased over the coming years to ensure fairness and ease of transition.
- 3.10 It has been decided that there should be a maximum of two permits per residence and that “grandfather rights” to higher numbers allocated should be reduced over time with an advertised cut-off time for final reduction to two.

#### **4 Resident Visitor Permits**

- 4.1 These again differ in the style and number allowed. Some areas are annual, some are by the pack, and some are sold by the day or by a fixed duration. The cost of providing the stationery or system must be covered by the fee charged as schemes cannot be subsidised.
- 4.2 Substantial efficiencies can be gained by converting this to a digital process administered online and through the patrolling officer's online computer. Plans are well advanced for this transfer to "MiPermit" which it is hoped to introduce between winter 2012 – spring 2013 and well in time for the new financial year.

#### **5 Special Dispensations**

- 5.1 It would be much simpler to administer a single "Waiver Certificate" for people calling at properties where there is no resident (presently only the resident can apply for a permit or visitor permits).
- 5.2 Many trades work in residential areas at unoccupied premises and to make their job easier a single "Waiver Certificate" is proposed. More information is in shown Appendix A

## **6 Decisions for consideration**

- 6.1 Members are asked to consider the attached fees and charges for adoption and to decide if, and in broad detail, where and how to implement kerb side machine-managed parking.

At the 2011 Annual General Meeting, Members were asked to consider the prices for future years. Discussion at that meeting centred around restructuring prices for coming years, including concessions. It was agreed that the pricing of these elements would be approved annually, hence this progress report.

Members are therefore asked to debate and consider the fees and charges shown in the Tables and Appendices, and summarised below, and decide what the future pricing structure should be.

Members are asked to debate and decide the prices in the attached Appendix:

For Resident Parking and other permits

- at what level and basis, the charges in Appendix C should be levied – using the table as a guide;
- how to converge the pricing and conditions over coming years;
- whether to allow concessionary permits, to whom, and at what level; and
- whether to continue to review these annually.

For kerbside management and pay and display

- to consider, debate and decide if kerbside management should be introduced, and suggest where this would be most appropriate to support the Business Case; and
- to consider the level of pay and display charges, in co-ordination with local car park prices;

And

- to consider providing a new traders' permit known as a Waiver Certificate for use at empty properties and for frequent visits.

## **Appendix A – Waiver Certificate details**

### **Waiver Certificate**

To make it easier for businesses who need to work at empty properties and make frequent short visits, we propose a Waiver Certificate which will be for sale.

This would be available wherever a Visitor Permit would otherwise be used when providing services such as plumbing, building, electrical, gas or Estate Agents. The permit is issued so that traders can make frequent stops to visit customers.

Only one NEPP district was offering a concession for business use which was sent to residents. It meant that they were charging their residents to park but not traders and it is not mentioned in the traffic order. The process needs to be formalised, and a cost decided.

We would ask that traders provide proof of trading. There are only certain proofs that we would accept:

- Utility bill (dated within three months)
- Business rates (for the current year)
- Tenancy agreement (dated and signed within three months)
- Letter from Inland Revenue (dated for the current tax year)
- Letter from solicitor confirming business name and address (dated within three months)
- Invoice into the company confirming business name and address (dated within three months)

It is considered reasonable to introduce the permit at a price of £300 (for example) to park throughout the NEPP (avoiding the need for traders to end up paying twice if working near the border of two districts).

Half yearly and quarterly permits could be provided at a small surcharge at £90 a quarter or £175 for six months with a discount of (say) 15% offered on MiPermit for using the digital system.

The proposed price fits well with the current Business work rate in such properties which otherwise requires a dispensation at £20 a day and £5 for each day thereafter per location.

Dispensations would continue for yellow-line exemptions which would be on a case-by-case basis.

## **Appendix B – Price details**

The Committee is asked to review, debate and decide on new prices for Permits of all types for the coming financial year, in order to maintain progress against the Business Plan, to harmonise the scheme prices, and to ensure that the operation covers the costs of administering the schemes.

**[please note this table is attached in a separate spreadsheet for easy reference]**