

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Charging options in relation to Sunday parking</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>12 June 2014</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director for Environment, Development &amp; Housing</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Austen Hunter</b>	<b>Tel: 29-2245</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>austen.hunter@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE**

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 1.1 At Full Council on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2014 a petition was presented *“to introduce free Sunday car parking and on street parking across Brighton & Hove.”*
- 1.2 An amendment was tabled *“that the petition is referred to the Policy & Resources Committee for consideration accompanied by a full Officer report on the proposal, including an estimate of the costs of partial or full implementation of free Sunday parking and an impartial assessment of the advantages and disadvantages.”*
- 1.3 The Committee is asked to consider three options for parking charges:
  - 1) Citywide free parking on Sundays
  - 2) Partial free parking on Sundays
  - 3) Refer alternative suggestions for parking charges to the annual review at the end of the year for consideration

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the Committee decides to refer alternative suggestions for parking charges to the annual review at the end of the year for consideration (option 3).

**3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 3.1 Parking controls are an integral part of the city’s Transport Strategy to meet the authority’s duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 of *securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority’s road network*. It supports efforts to encourage sustainable transport choices, improve road safety and prioritisation of accessibility for groups with specific needs, such as residents, disabled people, businesses or those who need to load and unload. Proper and effective parking and traffic management is essential to support sustainable growth in our city.
- 3.2 In general, parking charges can benefit businesses by encouraging turnover of spaces, which helps to increase footfall and spend. Charging can also help to reduce congestion making it easier for people to access businesses and reduce pollution, making the city a more attractive place.

- 3.3 In some parts of the city, the pressure on parking is as high, if not higher, on a Sunday compared to other times during the week. For example, the Lanes Car Park regularly reaches capacity on a Sunday because it is at the heart of the tourist and shopping area.
- 3.4 The charging system helps to relieve pressure on parking. The risks of free parking are that it would encourage more private vehicle use, creating additional congestion and air quality issues. This could make the city a less attractive place to visit and impact the economy.
- 3.5 A Report for COST Technical Committee on Transport, Action 342 "*Parking Policies and the Effects on Economy and Mobility*", has shown that parking charges can help to prevent long-term (commuter) parking and encourage the turnover of parking space making cities more accessible to visitors and helping to increase retail footfall.
- 3.6 The report to Environment Cabinet Member Meeting, "*Hanover & Elm Grove Resident Parking Scheme Review Community Consultation*" on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2010 details consultation with residents which showed that in some areas a majority have been in favour of Sunday controls due to problems experienced when previously there were none. As most on-street bays are shared use between visitors and residents, introducing free parking is likely to make it harder for residents to gain access. A reversal of this decision would necessitate a new consultation with residents.
- 3.7 Residents and visitors would be able to save on the cost of parking that would otherwise be required on a Sunday.
- 3.8 Free parking would benefit long term parkers, for example, commuters.
- 3.9 There would be a marketing benefit for the city to promote lower cost access, which could attract additional visitors.
- 3.10 Whilst there could be a marginal saving on the cost of parking enforcement and cash collection, overall it is not anticipated that there would be any other cost savings in relation to security, maintenance and overheads, without foregoing our accreditation for "Park Mark" (safer parking).
- 3.11 At the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2014, a six-month trial of free parking at weekends for hotel guests at Norton Road Car Park in Hove was agreed and is now in progress. The results of this trial will be reported back to the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee.

#### **Option 1 – Citywide free parking on Sundays**

- 3.12 This option reflects the proposal made in the petition presented to Full Council and includes both on and off-street car parking.
- 3.13 The traffic management risks associated with this approach are outlined above and for those reasons this option is not recommended.

- 3.14 The reduction of Pay & Display and Pay by Phone income for this option is estimated to be approximately £1.8 million per annum.
- 3.15 It is likely that residents and car park season ticket holders would request a refund for Sundays. The cost of this is estimated at £0.4m.
- 3.16 The reduction of visitor permit income is estimated at £0.2 million per annum.
- 3.17 The reduction of penalty charge income is estimated at £0.2 million per annum.
- 3.18 The cost of changing signs across the city is estimated at £1 million.
- 3.19 The cost of consulting residents and advertising changes to the Traffic Regulation Order is estimated at £0.035 million.

<b>Financial impact of Option 1 (estimate)</b>	<b>£million</b>
<b>Ongoing costs per annum</b>	
Pay & Display / Pay by Phone income	1.8
Resident permit and car park season ticket income	0.4
Visitor permit income	0.2
Penalty Charge income	0.2
<b>Total ongoing costs per annum</b>	<b>2.6</b>
<b>One-off costs</b>	
Changes to signs citywide	1
Consultation and advertising Traffic Regulation Order	0.035
<b>Total one-off costs</b>	<b>1.035</b>

### **Option 2 - Partial free parking on Sundays (Free Off-Street Parking only)**

- 3.20 Below is summary of the estimated utilisation in car parks operated by the council.\*

<b>Car Park</b>	<b>No. Spaces</b>	<b>Sunday Utilisation</b>		<b>Saturday Utilisation</b>		<b>Avg Weekday Utilisation</b>	
		<b>Apr - Sep</b>	<b>Oct - Mar</b>	<b>Apr - Sep</b>	<b>Oct - Mar</b>	<b>Apr - Sep</b>	<b>Oct - Mar</b>
The Lanes	355	82%	70%	98%	86%	58%	52%
London Road	528	29%	29%	61%	69%	52%**	53%**
Regency Square	507	48%	34%	55%	55%	25%	22%
Trafalgar Street	275	80%	87%	90%	98%	91%	91%
Black Rock	58	52%	12%	39%	9%	25%	6%
Carlton Hill	52	86%	45%	65%	76%	92%	94%
Haddington Street	33	56%	56%	61%	61%	55%	55%
High Street	81	30%	23%	69%	50%	31%	23%
King Alfred	120	89%	65%	97%	67%	44%	50%
Norton Road	290	17%	8%	27%	22%	59%	53%

Oxford Court	36	25%	32%	57%	74%	53%	57%
Rottingdean Marine	100	36%	26%	22%	22%	26%	11%
Rottingdean West St	65	78%	72%	78%	77%	76%	57%

\* All data covers the core usage period in the car parks between 9am and 6pm.

\*\* On weekdays, there can be up to 200 annual ticket holders at London Road car park, which impacts on available space for daily parkers.

- 3.21 It is highly likely that free parking will displace parking from charged bays to free sites. The annual impact of this shift, in addition to the direct loss of income from the car parks on Sundays, is estimated below.

Car Park	No. Spaces	Sunday income (est.)	Displacement from charged on-street bays (est.)	Total impact
The Lanes	355	£275,248	£11,256	£286,504
London Road	528	£49,754	£5,681	£55,435
Regency Square	507	£180,410	£11,256	£191,666
Trafalgar Street	275	£128,851	£5,681	£134,532
Black Rock	58	£4,800	£2,289	£7,089
Carlton Hill	52	£23,202	£5,137	£28,339
Haddington Street	33	£7,251	£5,758	£13,009
High Street	81	£12,296	£4,894	£17,190
King Alfred	120	£43,366	£3,928	£47,294
Norton Road	290	£9,146	£7,262	£16,408
Oxford Court	36	£5,614	£500	£6,114
Rottingdean Marine	100	£4,039	£55	£4,094
Rottingdean West St	65	£6,349	£55	£6,404
<b>Total</b>				<b>£814,078</b>

- 3.22 In line with the amendment, as presented at Full Council, this option includes an extension of the lower rate winter season to 6 months from 1<sup>st</sup> October – 31<sup>st</sup> March.

- 3.23 The financial impact of extending the winter season is estimated at £90,000.

<b>Financial impact of Option 2 (estimate)</b>	<b>£million</b>
<b>Ongoing costs per annum</b>	
Pay & Display / Pay by Phone income	0.81
Season ticket reductions	0.04
Extension of winter season	0.09
<b>Total ongoing costs per annum</b>	<b>0.94</b>
<b>One-off costs</b>	
Changes to signs	0.015
Consultation and advertising Traffic Regulation Order	0.005
<b>Total one-off costs</b>	<b>0.02</b>

#### **4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

##### **Option 3 – Refer alternative suggestions for parking charges to the annual review at the end of the year for consideration**

- 4.1 Free parking is likely to increase private vehicle usage and as a result be detrimental to accessibility, the local economy and the environment.
- 4.2 Sunday is often busier than other days during the week for many parts of the city.
- 4.3 For these reasons, it is not recommended that new free parking be introduced on Sundays but that alternative suggestions for parking charges are referred to the annual review of charges that is carried out after the summer. This could include options for promotional rates at Norton Road Car Park, London Road Car Park and Oxford Court Car Park where demand is low on a Sunday.

#### **5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 Before parking controls are introduced, there is always a full consultation with local residents and measures are only introduced where a majority are in favour. For example, 53% of those who responded to the consultation in Queens Park (Area C) were in favour of extending the days of operation to include Sundays. The Queens Park Ward Councillors also wrote to officers to support the days of operation including Sundays and the local Hoteliers and Guest House Association who were finding that unregulated parking on Sundays made it difficult for guests to park also expressed support.
- 5.2 The proposals were debated at Full Council and the views expressed by nine ward councillors taken into account.
- 5.3 A letter has been received from the City Sustainability Partnership (see appendix 1) and e-mails from the Transport Partnership expressing concern over the proposals to introduce free parking citing:
  - Likely impact on carbon emissions
  - Likely impact on air quality and how it fits with the Air Quality Action Plan
  - Possible impact on active travel (walking and cycling)
  - Direct financial cost to public purse
  - Potential loss of income for the bus company
  - Vulnerability of Sunday bus services to any loss of revenue, particularly if it leads to pressure for more Council supported services and the cost of this if it were to happen

## **6. CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 The risks associated with removing parking charges are increased private vehicle journeys, increased congestion, a negative impact on the economy and the environment in the form of air pollution.
- 6.2 The nature of Brighton & Hove as a major tourist and shopping destination attracting high volumes of visitors at weekends means that the pressure on parking space is often higher at the weekend than it is during the week.
- 6.3 For these reasons it is not recommended to introduce citywide or partial free parking on Sundays.
- 6.4 Instead of free parking, reduced rates or alternative use of space might be considered in areas of low demand. For example, at Norton Road Car Park in Hove; London Road Car Park and Oxford Court Car Park in the London Road area.
- 6.5 It is recommended that alternative suggestions for parking charges are referred to the annual review of charges that is carried out after the summer.

## **7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

### Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The estimated loss of parking income of options 1 and 2 has been based on the best information available and has taken account of current levels of activity, known seasonal variations and likely responses to price changes. Parking activity is difficult to forecast with any accuracy due to a range of factors that can impact on usage and therefore it is possible that the impact of either option could be different to the estimates presented.

Options one and two would represent a significant reduction in income to the council and are therefore outside of the budget and financial framework approved at Full Council on 5th March 2014. For these proposals to be progressed they would need Full Council approval identifying how the loss of income would be funded.

### Option 1

The estimated annual loss of Pay & Display and Pay by Phone income of option 1 is estimated to be between £1.7m and £1.8m.

Annual loss of income from resident permits and car park season tickets is estimated at £0.4m.

Annual loss of income from visitor permits is estimated at £0.2m.

It is also estimated that the annual loss from less penalty charges notices (PCN's) being issued will be approximately £0.2m.

There will also be one-off costs including consultations, advertising and making of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) (if necessary), changes to signage and

programming of on-street machines. The total one-off costs are expected to be in excess of £1.0m.

### **Option 2**

The estimated loss in income of option 2 is estimated to be between £0.9m and £1.0m.

Assumptions have been made for likely loss of income from displacement from charged on-street bays based on the Small Business Saturday parking tariffs adjusted for likely seasonal variations. There will also be one-off costs including change to signage, changes to tariff cards and programming of off-street machines. The total one-off costs are expected to be in approximately £20,000.

The estimated costs do not make any allowance for the cost of any potential challenge to, or losses arising from, these options by other either parties who may see them as detrimental to their business.

Both options would also see some reductions in costs including maintenance, enforcement and cash collections. The reduction in costs are difficult to quantify, but are considered to be minimal in comparison to the potential loss of income.

For options 1 and 2 to be considered for future years, they would need to be included in future budget setting processes as this would create a recurring pressure within the Transport service. Funding of one-off costs would also have to be identified.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford*

*Date: 09/05/14*

### **Legal Implications:**

- 7.2 Under sections 32 and 35 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“the Act”), there is power to the Council to provide off-street parking places and regulate their use for the purpose of relieving or preventing congestion. Section 45 of the Act allows Councils to designate parking places on the highway and to charge for their use.
- 7.3 Under section 55 of the Act, as amended by the Traffic Management Act 2004, the Council must keep an account of all parking income and expenditure in designated (i.e. on-street) parking spaces which are in a Civil Enforcement Area, and of their income and expenditure related to their functions as an enforcement authority. Income received can only be used for the purposes set out in s55, for example highway or environmental improvements: the Council cannot use its powers to charge local residents for parking in order to raise surplus revenue for other transport purposes.
- 7.4 The Council has power under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to vary the charges payable at off-street car parks and on street parking places by way of a notice. Procedural regulations set out the process that must be followed. A notice must be published in a newspaper circulating in the area and displayed in the affected car parks at least 21 days before the changes take effect.
- 7.5 It is not considered that any adverse human rights implications arise from this report

*Lawyer Consulted:*

*Katie Matthews*

*Date: 12/05/2014*

Equalities Implications:

- 7.6 A consistent approach to parking management helps to promote equal opportunities and to regulate better access to spaces.
- 7.7 Re-investing income in sustainable transport will benefit those without access to a car.

Sustainability Implications:

- 7.8 The proposed changes to charges will be taken into account in the decisions people take when travelling into the city. Any changes in the levels of car traffic that result will impact the city's environment and people's health.
- 7.9 The parking surplus has been used to provide free bus passes for the elderly and disabled to help reduce congestion and carbon emissions. A number of bus routes are subsidised through the parking surplus to provide alternatives to travelling to the city centre by car.

Any Other Significant Implications:

None



## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

### **Appendices:**

1. Letter from the City Sustainability Partnership

### **Documents in Members' Rooms**

None.

### **Background Documents**

1. *Parking Policies and the Effects on Economy and Mobility*, Report for COST Technical Committee on Transport, Action 342
2. 4.17 Report to Environment Cabinet Member Meeting, Hanover & Elm Grove Resident Parking Scheme Review Community Consultation, 16<sup>th</sup> September 2010
3. Report to Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee, 4<sup>th</sup> March 2014: Norton Road Car Park ~ Sunday Tariff