

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
Full Council
18th March 2014

Title: Report of the Residents' Parking Schemes Cross-Party Working Group

Ward: City-wide

Report presented by: Cllr Mark Weston

Contact Officer: Siân Parry, Scrutiny Officer
Telephone number: 0117 922 2074

Recommendation

That Full Council debates the report and asks the Mayor to consider the proposals put forward.

Summary

Following discussions at the Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commissions in May and June, the full Council meeting on 18th June and the Cabinet meeting on 27 June 2013, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board agreed to establish a cross-party working group on the Mayor's proposals for residents' parking schemes. This was delegated to the SD&T Scrutiny Commission and the Group was set up in October 2013.

The remit, work programme and recommendations of the Working Group are given in Appendix A.

Draft minutes of SD&T Scrutiny Commission and OSMB are given in Appendix B.

Policy

1. The overall policy context has been set out in previous reports to Cabinet and Full Council.

Consultation

2. The Group's work programme was produced in consultation with the Service Director Transport and other officers within the Place Directorate. Resident and business groups were invited to discuss local RPS schemes with the Working Group.

Recommendation

That Full Council debates the report and asks the Mayor to consider the proposals put forward.

Other Options Considered

Not applicable.

Risk Assessment

Not applicable.

Equalities Impact Assessment

The Public Sector Equality duty (Equality Act 2010 section 149) requires the Council to give due regard to the need to:

- a) Promote equality of opportunity
- b) Eliminate unlawful opportunity
- c) Promote good relations between people who share a 'protected' characteristic and those who do not

and the effect our policies and practices have on people who share the following protected characteristics

- Age
- Pregnancy and Maternity
- Transgender
- Sexual Orientation
- Religion and Belief
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Disability

An impact assessment will be considered as part of the executive response to the recommendations and any further Action Plan as appropriate.

Legal Implications

The recommendations proposed in the report are executive functions, and therefore it is for the Mayor, as the decision maker, to determine whether to accept any or all of them. Overview and Scrutiny rule 10 requires the Mayor to consider the recommendations and formally respond to the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee within two months of receiving the report.

As part of a robust decision-making process, technical, professional, financial and legal advice would need to be considered by the Mayor in relation to some of the recommendations if he is minded to consider them further.

Liam Nevin Service Director, Legal Services

Resource Implications

The current recommendation is to proceed with the inner RPS only. Our modelling shows that the inner scheme alone is capable of an earlier payback of the capital costs than would be the case where both inner and outer schemes were carried out at the same time. The Working Group has suggested that in addition to only proceeding with the inner ring, a lower charge should be made for permits. This is a financially viable position. The cost of the borrowing to fund the inner scheme would be covered by a £30 charge and other relevant income.

However, should the Council decide at a later date to proceed with the outer ring scheme as currently designed, there will be a need to decide how this will be financed. The outer ring would not be viable by itself as the modelled revenues would not cover the cost of borrowing. Therefore, should the Council decide to proceed with the outer ring scheme it will need to consider how the costs of the scheme are met. One possibility is to utilise income from the inner ring. This would need to be considered alongside the current goal of reducing permit prices in the inner ring as soon as financially possible.

Mike Allen, Finance Business Partner

Appendices

Appendix A: Final Report of the Residents' Parking Scheme Working Group.
Appendix B: Draft minutes of SD&T Scrutiny Commission and OSMB

Access to Information

Not applicable.

Executive Summary and Recommendations

1. Introduction

The Group met four times between October 2013 to January 2014 before writing its final report. This Executive Summary describes the key issues that the Group discussed, alongside recommendations to the Mayor.

2. Key issues and Recommendations

2.1 Communications, Engagement and Consultation

The Group found that the rushing out of the various schemes without fully formed and presented data and proper consultation, including changes to boundaries, stages and timescales has made the subsequent consultation process difficult. This has led to a great deal of confusion for many residents and businesses in the areas being taken forward currently. As a consequence this has forced local people to set up their own consultation processes in some areas. The Group do believe that officers have learnt from this process and will be able to improve on subsequent parking zone consultations; however this cannot hide the fact that the quality of the current consultations has been uneven.

The role of the Neighbourhood Partnerships and ward councillors was examined and the Group agreed that Neighbourhood Partnerships were a good vehicle for engaging with local residents. However they should not be solely relied on. For example initiatives such as the postcards being used in more recent schemes were considered invaluable. In addition it was felt that ward councillors had been heavily involved in the decisions about the consultation process in the relevant wards and had played their role in disseminating information.

The Group was particularly sensitive to the needs of equalities groups having heard for example about people needing to attend mosques for prayers on a Friday and the process for the retention of disabled parking bays, and these should be taken into account in the engagement and consultation processes.

The Full Council motion in June 2013 stated that a true consultation should allow residents to reject the scheme and the Group still considers this vital for a meaningful consultation. The Group accepts that it is now too late to alter the inner scheme consultation process; however, it felt that the concerns expressed by the public would have been lessened by the adoption of the philosophy embodied in the Council's own excellent Statement of Community Involvement drawn up for planning policy and development management (due for review this year) across the whole spectrum of the authority's activities.

Recommendation 1:

That for any future schemes coming forward in 2014, the consultation process must be robust. It is essential that the parameters of the consultation are clear (i.e. what can be changed through consultation and what can't). The Council must explain the consultation stages with a timetable of how the scheme will be delivered. Clear lines of communication must be opened with residents and businesses with prompt feedback given to queries and face-to-face meetings held where requested. The website must be constantly updated and it is critical to engage with traders, businesses and other commercial interests with a named RPS liaison officer.

2.2 Wider Transport Policy

Considering RPS within the wider context of transport policy for the city including improvements to public transport, park-and-ride and parking provision, the Group was concerned about the potential impact of demand rising for this provision without concomitant increase in supply.

When discussing the impact on bus services with First West of England, it was apparent that they had a responsive commercial model with up to a 3 month delay in providing extra buses and services. The Group was disappointed to note that the model did not take account of strategic issues such as RPS but relied solely on passenger uptake.

Public transport initiatives such as the Greater Bristol Bus Network (GBBN) bus corridors were discussed and the Group felt that the impacts of GBBN on parking and retail should be reviewed before any further RPS schemes are planned. St Pauls Unlimited contested that bus fares should be lower for people on benefits and this should be considered by the bus operators.

Recommendation 2: that the Mayor should work with all transport providers to carry out an urgent and fundamental review of the bus network throughout the city.

The locations of park-and-rides around the city are not helpful to people trying to access Clifton and other areas in the north of Bristol and routes need to be examined, for example a suggestion from a Traders' Association was to have a circular route linking up the Bath Road and Portway park-and-ride via Clifton.

Recommendation 3: that the Mayor should undertake a review of park-and-ride provision to ensure that the inner ring area is served adequately and with the routes better reflecting the destinations that people want to travel to, e.g. the Zoo.

Representatives from Clifton Village commented that there was one bus route and no car parking provision in the Village and this made the pressure on on-road parking even more acute. Further exploration of such provision needs to be done (see Cope's study for Bedminster Town Team regarding fundamentals for the high street and recommendations to ensure RPS benefits both residents and retailers). Other suggestions from business and residents' groups e.g. Gloucester Road Traders' Association and Winning Whiteladies Association should be taken into account.

Recommendation 4: that alongside the implementation of the inner ring RPS, off-street parking should be reviewed and the feasibility of new provision explored.

2.3 Costs and Charging Policy

The Group discussed many aspects of the financial background to RPS and its validity, value for money and robustness and the changes necessary to the Scheme given that the outer ring implementation had been put on hold. The Group was concerned about the affordability for low income individuals, families and small businesses given that the cost of permits has increased for new schemes, even though there is no relationship between the permit price and the payback borrowing period on schemes.

The Group heard that the price of permits for the existing schemes were going to be increased in line with the new schemes. Of particular note was that the proposed income streams would lead to a repayment on the capital for the inner scheme within 7 years. Previously when the outer scheme was being proposed alongside the inner scheme this repayment date was 10 years, clearly illustrating how the inner scheme permit holders would be subsidising those in the outer scheme.

Since the 'outer ring' scheme has been put on hold, the Group was concerned what the income would be used for after the repayment had been achieved. It was felt that by extending the repayment time back to the original 10 years for the inner scheme that the price could be dropped for residents within the inner zone.

Recommendation 5: That any enforcement charges gathered throughout the inner zone should be used to repay the capital costs as early as possible, and that once the capital costs are paid off a review of permit prices take place with the goal of reducing permit pricing to the lowest possible level.

Recommendation 6: That medical professionals frequently needing to travel to patients to carry out their duties within the city be issued with permits free of charge to allow them to to carry out their duties in protecting public health.

2.4 Design and Tailoring of Schemes to Local Communities

During 2013, the SD&T Commission received many representations from residents, community groups, councillors and business representatives about possible changes to the proposed schemes or completely alternative schemes for their areas. The Group was clear that alternative schemes should be considered as part of the consultation process, and urged the Mayor to take into account the vast amount of consultation already done by local people and councillors in Clifton, Ashley and St Paul's. The principle of tailoring the scheme to reflect the needs of the local community was supported by the Group, e.g. extending free parking to one hour in some areas. The Group was concerned that when alternative schemes were proposed by residents or other community groups, it appeared that these had been dismissed by officers without a clear explanation as to why that is.

Recommendation 7: That where possible alternative schemes should be considered and incorporated by the officers into the final model (i.e. such as the Clifton BID and Ashley proposals). Where a proposal is not feasible then a clear explanation as to why should be made available to the public.

The Group discussed the flexibility and types of permits, particularly for individuals or organisations who needed a city-wide or mobile business permit. These issues have been taken on board by officers during the implementation of RPS. The Group also considered the outer boundaries of proposed schemes and the potential impacts on the outer ring and concluded that a formal review was needed of current schemes being implemented, including emerging traffic patterns before any further schemes are taken forward.

Recommendation 8: That the Mayor should carry out a formal review of current schemes being implemented, including emerging traffic patterns and the impacts on the outer ring before any further schemes are taken forward. A report detailing the review findings should be brought to SD&T Commission at an appropriate time before the Mayor makes any decisions on the outer ring.

2.5 Baseline Evidence and Data

The Group considered the information it requested following on from the early Commission discussions in spring 2013 such as analysis of costs and income, comparative data etc. No examples or options were presented on the schemes that other core cities have in place which include everything from no fees to higher fees than Bristol. Much was made of other core cities having RPS and some evidence was presented, but no in-depth comparisons. The Group agreed that if the outer ring is explored in future, early provision of relevant data analysis to scrutiny and to the public including current traffic studies should be made.

Recommendation 9: That if the outer ring is explored in future, early provision of relevant data analysis to scrutiny and to the public including current traffic studies should be made.

2.6 Council Governance

The Group heard that members of the public had difficulty accessing key RPS documents before public Scrutiny and Cabinet meetings in sufficient time to consider them and put forward their views for example it was queried why questions could only be asked 3 days before a meeting and yet papers were released for that meeting only 5 days prior to it. The Group considered that from its experience over the last year, this aspect of Council governance needed to be examined and improved so that the public could access relevant information for the decision-making process in good time. This is also partly about the consultation process being robust enough so that people's views are taken into account at an early stage in policy formulation, as stated in section 2.1.

Recommendation 10: that the Mayor should consider how to improve the public's access to information during the decision-making process.

1. Introduction

Following the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commissions in May and June considering the Mayor's Residents Parking Scheme proposals, Full Council agreed on 18th June that the Mayor should halt the process and meet with an all-party working group in order to produce a more gradual phased approach with greater consultation and input from local residents and businesses. Subsequently the Cabinet meeting on 27th June agreed various changes to the programme, but the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board supported the suggestion that a working group should scrutinise the implementation of the proposals. It delegated this task to the SD&T Commission and the Group was set up with its first meeting held on 8th October

The Group met four times between October 2013 to January 2014 before writing its final report.

2. Terms of Reference

Purpose

In the light of the decision taken by Cabinet on 27th June 2013 (whereby significant changes had been made to the programme since the motion to establish a cross-party working group was passed by Full Council on 18th June), the purpose of the group was to conduct a review of the process for consulting on and implementing the programme of RPS areas, to ensure this fully satisfies the expectations of Council. As part of this, the working group followed up the previous recommendations of the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commission and investigated their practical implementation.

Accountability

Accountability was delegated from OSMB to the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commission. A short feedback report was prepared for the Commission's 19th December 2013 formal meeting.

Remit

- Involvement of ward councillors;
- Consultation with local people;
- Tailoring schemes to local communities, including their facilities;
- Engagement with businesses and business representatives;
- Role of Neighbourhood Partnerships;
- Process for receiving and acting on comments and suggestions;
- Transparency of decision making on the final Traffic Regulation Order objection report;
- Communication and information provision through scheme implementation;
- Opportunities presented by scheme review.

Meetings

The Group held four meetings between October 2013 and January 2014. The meetings comprised written and/or verbal updates from officers on each aspect of the Group's remit, discussion and questions for clarification and a review of the various aspects within the overall brief. Information on past and current practice in Bristol and experience from elsewhere, including on consultation, was sought and used as part of the review.

As Commission meetings are held in public, public statements were requested on, for example alternative schemes and these were fed into the overall consultation process. The Group also invited in residents' and traders' groups in January to discuss their views on the RPS implementation process (see Appendix 1 for details attendance). Each group was invited to give a short presentation of their concerns – some of these were presented at SD&T Commission's Public Forum on 19th December (circulated to the Group) and these are publicly available, i.e. BID Clifton Village, Keep Clifton Special, Ashley Ward RPS Action Group; others are summarised in Appendix 2.

Membership

The Group comprised:

Councillor Mark Weston (chair) Conservative
Councillor Charles Lucas Conservative
Councillor Christian Martin Liberal Democrat
Councillor Fi Hance Liberal Democrat
Councillor Daniella Radice Green
Councillor Steve Pearce Labour
Councillor Margaret Hickman Labour
Councillor Jason Budd Independent

(It was originally agreed that the Group would have 2 members per party, but the Green Party proposed that Councillor Radice would be their only representative.)

The Group was supported by Peter Mann Service Director Transport and Helen Minnery Project Manager with other officers as necessary. Councillor Mark Bradshaw Assistant Mayor was invited.

3. Key Themes

The Group agreed priority areas of work within its remit and these are detailed below based on the following themes:

- Current situation and implementation
- Communications, engagement and consultation
- Wider transport policy
- Costs
- Design and tailoring of schemes to local communities
- Baseline evidence and data
- Council decision-making

3.1 Current situation and implementation

The Group discussed the current situation and the implementation process with officers. It was explained that there would be delegated decisions on all the inner ring schemes and the timescales took into account the May elections, potential build time for each scheme and community engagement etc. The changes to the overall programme were discussed, for example in Clifton and Redland, but it was clarified that there were no changes as to who was being consulted and how consultation will take place.

3.2 Communications, Engagement and Consultation

The Group discussed the details of the consultation process which included online dialogue and face-to-face meetings. Officers outlined that the business sector was starting to see the need for the schemes and to be involved; they were submitting written statements. The Group also discussed the needs of mosques, churches and schools and their parking issues. It was explained that lessons from the City Centre parking scheme would be used, for example in developing travel plans for staff, and disseminating information on public and other forms of transport that could be used. There would also be more support for travel planning for small businesses and other organisations and advice on off-street parking.

Redland Girls' School was discussed as an example where the permit allocation has been negotiated with them individually. Officers explained that the Council needs to have a process which is equitable and weighs up how many permits should be available for each organisation. The Group discussed the possibility of quantifying the number of organisations and consequently the permits needed. However, officers explained that this is being clarified through informal consultation and will be implemented on an individual basis.

Role of Ward Councillors and Neighbourhood Partnerships

The informal stage of the process was agreed by Cabinet in June 2013. Local councillors were asked in each area what their views were and Clifton Village and Clifton West carried on to the fast-track stage, whilst Clifton East requested an informal consultation stage. The advantages of the informal stage were discussed and officers outlined that all additional schemes have this built in. Neighbourhood partnerships have been a helpful resource for officers to use as a vehicle for consultation but there was an overreliance on these and the initiative of postcards etc in more recent schemes was valuable. The Group agreed it was essential to tell people what the response is and what can and can't be done.

The Group agreed that the Council needs to learn from the process over the last year and plan ahead/communicate better although some businesses haven't responded until very recently and this has proved difficult for officers to take their views into account. The Group supported having a named facilitation officer who has worked really hard in the Clifton area and agreed there is no magic wand for communicating with traders. The parameters of any consultation need to be stated very clearly.

Regarding the need for a high quality consultation process, the Group discussed the exemplar Statement of Community Involvement (see [SCI](#)) which was produced by the Council in 2008 to apply to planning policy and development management. The Group agreed that the adoption of the philosophy embodied in the SCI (due for review this year) should be considered across the whole spectrum of the authority's activities.

The Traffic Regulation Order Process

There was general confusion about what consultation meant to the public and this has added to the problems experienced in different areas. Officers explained the TRO process which is a legal process with the legal notice posted on lampposts in the relevant area and proposals for objections requested. These are each logged

and registered and then the Council responds as part of a formal legal report. A decision is then delegated (under delegated powers confirmed in June 2013) to the Service Director Transport in discussion with the Cabinet member and signed off and an order is made.

Opportunities presented by Scheme Reviews

Every scheme is reviewed after 6 months, and every resident and business is written to and asked for their views including councillors and neighbourhood partnerships. A new TRO proposal is drawn up and this is formally consulted on again; reviews of, for example disabled parking bays, parking hours, yellow lines etc can be done as part of the general TRO process, and then this is done on an annual basis thereafter.

Council Governance

The Group heard that members of the public had difficulty accessing key RPS documents before public Scrutiny and Cabinet meetings in sufficient time to consider them and put forward their views for example it was queried why questions could only be asked 3 days before a meeting and yet papers were released for that meeting only 5 days prior to it. The Group considered that from its experience over the last year, this aspect of Council governance needed to be examined and improved so that the public could access relevant information for the decision-making process in good time. This is also partly about the consultation process being robust enough so that people's views are taken into account at an early stage in policy formulation.

3.3 Wider Transport Policy

Impact on Public Transport

The Group queried the extra capacity needed in public transport and whether that had been modelled. Officers explained that information was not collected on a scheme by scheme basis but assumptions can be made from pay and display revenue. GBBN ensures that enhancements can be made relatively straightforwardly and there is a £2 million bus subsidy from the Council at present. The Group expressed concerns about the potential increase in demand and whether the network could accommodate it.

Paul Matthews Managing Director of First West of England attended the Group to discuss the potential impact of RPS on the bus network. He stated that First had an on-going dialogue about strategic issues with the Council, Cabinet member and the Mayor, but the network responds directly to demand. If there is potential growth in a particular area they would develop the market. For example recently with GBBN and the reduction in fares, there has been very strong growth and 12 vehicles have been added in the last 12 months. So they can provide additional capacity and will do so in response to RPS as it comes in.

Officers stated that the Council is confident that demand can be met and the model allows this. The Group queried the impact of the inner ring implementation on the outer ring and officers contested the model will still work. Congestion affects buses and their reliability, so as RPS comes in bus passengers will rise. There was no research available on other cities apart from London where demand restraint was considerable, but the network is always under review to meet new demand e.g.

Southmead Hospital development. The Group heard that new provision can come on stream quite quickly although this varies depending on the recruitment of staff and procurement of vehicles as necessary – for the latter this can take up to 3 months.

Regarding the fares consultation, First discussed this with the Mayor, but the implementation was a commercial decision to benefit all customers. First recognises there is a long way to go, but they are trying to encourage more people to travel by bus and are increasing investment accordingly. It has not been specifically targeted at RPS areas.

Resident and business groups raised the issue of inadequate park-and-ride facilities before their areas and officers stated that the operation had been extended by 2 hours. Routing was actively under discussion but it was not a short-term fix. Brislington and Portway links were being examined but there were considerations about funding issues and also whether it was commercially viable.

3.4 Costs and Charging Policy

The charging policy was examined covering residential permits, business permits, city-wide permits, and the cost of implementation and expected revenue. Officers outlined the financial framework which had been discussed at the Resources Commission earlier in the year. The Group focused on the inner ring as the outer ring is on hold. Issues were raised as follows:

- Penalty charges were excluded as this was imprudent financially; fees and charges meant Pay and Display; assumptions had been made on take-up numbers, but officers were happy the estimates were sound. The Group requested the income from penalty charges.
- The cost and definition of disabled parking bays/spaces were discussed and the Group asked to see the overall breakdown of cost. The requirement for these bays was reviewed at a review point.
- The Redland figures were queried and whether they had been calculated on the old proposed scheme. Officers agreed that these were the old figures before the scheme had been revised and would send updated estimates to the Group.
- The cost of permits in the existing schemes compared with the new schemes were queried, the rates of pay back and how these were calculated. If the new schemes were successful in generating income, would the price of the permits be reduced? Officers explained that this was not in the financial model and it could not be changed partway through the process. The loan may be paid off earlier or a decision could be taken to reduce the permit price at the end of the 6 years. On-going costs would still need to be found after this period. There is potential for variation, but the new schemes were expected to break even. It was suggested that it should not become an income stream and that after the loan is repaid, further discussions need to take place about permit pricing.
- It was pointed out that as reviews of schemes were undertaken and changes in Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) were made/ statutory consultation was carried out, the pricing was being proposed to be standardised at the new rate. All schemes would require TRO amendments, however minor. It was

queried whether deprivation rates in Easton and St Philips would be taken into account; officers replied that these areas would be consistent with the overall approach.

- The Group queried the breakeven point between £30 and £48? And what price would the inner ring be if it was a 10 year payback period? Would this include the surplus? Officers explained that the original Resources Scrutiny Commission paper modelled the whole scheme at £30 and the bottom line would be to extend the period of the loan. The Group suggested that the cost of the annual reviews could vary and the reduction for low emission cars could have an impact on the revenue, as the budget was intended to be cost neutral.
- The Group learned that the budget and costings had been calculated to fit around the figure of £48 – but the calculation spreadsheet it considered demonstrated payback and affordability at the £30 level charged in the existing schemes; once paid back, the Group considered that fees should be removed altogether. The Group did not have an opportunity to revisit the costings, but heard that it was not a revenue raiser for the council. However, the on – going £500k annual costs were not revisited nor drilled down any further past initial concerns. The Group considered that there are no safeguards that the revenue won't simply be allocated into the RPS budget on an annual basis creating a new revenue stream and removing it from the central budget. The Group also raised concerns when it learned that penalties charges don't go into paying off the scheme; this money needed to be accounted for.
- The relationship between the inner and outer rings was discussed and officers explained that the outer ring was less financially viable as it is resourced from a Council loan. Officers outlined that the outer ring would take 14 years to pay back if done in isolation, whereas the existing schemes were supported by the Local Transport Plan and therefore were cheaper to implement.
- Indirect costs were discussed and clarified, i.e. data collection costs and remit of annual review of each area (signage, lines, maintenance) £450k, whilst direct costs products £562k, the overall capital interest repayment equalled £3.5m over 6 years in total.
- The Group queried the income from the existing schemes and requested a comparison of predicted versus actual income on those. It also queried how enforcement would work and how parking services would deal with this.
- Officers explained that enforcement will be done in conjunction with the rollout and is included in the revenue costs. The monitoring of the schemes was queried and how this will be broken down, particularly the data from the existing schemes. It was explained that the programme is being monitored as a whole rather than individual schemes and this is part of the annual review including other issues such as knock-on effects. A 'steady state' is needed to judge the success of the implementation; the Group felt that this may be an issue as schemes roll out.

3.5 Design and Tailoring of Schemes to Local Communities

Permits

The Group questioned the information that is available for particular areas, for example parking spaces, businesses, and consequently the number of permits necessary and more generally the underlying purpose of RPS. Officers explained that not all of this data is available at this time. They also outlined that the principle of permit allocation would be applied to all areas but only if it works; retrofitting would only be used if previous schemes need to change, and a review system is built in so that changes can be made anyway. For example Kingsdown has had regular reviews and slight changes have been made depending on the benefits and whether there is the demand. Data from the Census, Travel to Work Areas and car ownership details have been used to inform this process. The Schemes are flexible enough to deal with issues raised in each area, for example Cotham South – it was not possible to estimate how many permits businesses would take up and the actual permits allocated were lower than expected. It is not possible to extrapolate from this to other areas.

The Group queried whether empty spaces would be made available further down the line for businesses or commuters? Officers agreed this would be considered following review and it was why they're being cautious about permit numbers. Business permits are subject to operational need.

The Group requested an operational definition for business permits. Officers explained that the vehicle needed to be insured for business use and there would be a customer/business permits mix for new schemes. These permits varied in price depending on their purpose.

The Group agreed to examine Cotham South and Clifton Village as case studies to establish what has happened so far, the changes that have been made, the data available, the engagement process and lessons learnt.

Case Study: Cotham South

Case study details for Cotham South were scrutinised (see Appendix 3) and the following queries were raised:

- Would RPS lead to residents tarmacking over their front gardens? It was explained that there were very few instances of this because of the cost of doing so compared with the price of the permit. It would also be more difficult in a conservation area. There had been one application for a change of access.
- Changing yellow lines is not a problem for disabled parking bays at the moment as the Council absorbs costs, but they may review this. People do need to pay to have a dropped kerb.
- A car has to be registered in the name of the person living at the address; complications may arise with students who may have a car registered under a parent's name. HMOs are treated as an individual address unless the property is divided into separate households. At the review stage a follow-up survey is sent to all households as they may have visitor, resident or business

permits or may wish to apply for one.

- How were the number of spaces calculated in Cotham? It was explained that this is estimated by looking at the amount of parking space in each street, but the number of spaces cannot be calculated exactly due to different parking patterns, type of vehicles etc.
- How many 2nd and 3rd permits have been requested? Officers said they were not sure that they could provide the data for both residents and businesses, but would produce the data if it is available.
- Regarding permits and allocations for schools, officers outlined the experience from the Cotham South scheme where Cotham school, following engagement, requested no permits although 2 business and 5 customer permits were offered. Other schools were discussed, for example in Clifton and individual agreements were being negotiated with schools. The Group made the point that many of these establishments had low-paid staff who may not be able to pay parking fees. Officers explained that in Kingsdown, the University of Bristol owned several streets and it was imperative that the operational impact was analysed and a scheme was designed that works.

Equalities Issues

It was queried whether a solution would be found for mosques in Lawrence Hill and Eastern regarding Friday prayers and asked whether muslims were disproportionately affected as a result of their faith. What steps have been taken to mitigate the equality duty? Officers explained that there would be a business permit allocation, free pay and display parking for thirty minutes and longer stays for £1 an hour. There would be a better opportunity to park once the schemes in place than before as there is currently very little parking. It was queried that as this was a TRO issue, would it need to be applied across Bristol and if so, could this be varied? Was it within their scope to alter for example the length of free parking e.g. up to an hour.

Officers explained they didn't want a discretionary enforcement regime and that a full Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out (circulated to the Group). There are other faith groups that could be similarly affected for example, people attending church services during the week.

Alternative schemes

Resident and business groups suggested alternative schemes such as those at south-east stations serving London which have a very short operating period, but officers stated that for Bristol these schemes would be too easy for people to work around so they have little benefit. Residents can ask for extended hours after the review process if 9 to 5 p.m. is inadequate.

Residents groups were keen to see their proposed solutions put into place to see if they work for 6 months and then review. They were willing to pay for it with support from the Council but would like an assurance that the Council will consider schemes in areas which are not yet directly affected and discuss these with residents. The point was made that different areas need different schemes (Pay-and-display machines in Cotham and Redcliffe are not being used, so are a waste of resources).

Officers suggested that as one scheme at a time has to be introduced, the inner ring needs to be reviewed once it is in a 'steady state'. Residents' and business groups were concerned that this would be too late.

3.6 Baseline Evidence and Data

The Group had requested data on comparative schemes across the country and officers explained that there is no national model; Bristol's approach was very flexible but would circulate data they had, see Appendix 4.

SDT COMMISSION 13/2/14

**54.02/14 RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME CROSS-PARTY
WORKING GROUP REPORT**

The Commission considered a report of the Chair of the Working Group (agenda item 11) detailing the recommendations of the Working Group.

The Chair, as Chair of the Working Group, reported that the Working Group had been set up in June 2012 as a forum for consulting residents and taking forward their views. However, the first meeting did not take place until October so the Working Group had been working hard to retrofit its work.

Stakeholder groups were invited to a meeting on 14 January 2014 and a set of constructive recommendations were produced. It was understood that it was no longer about stopping the schemes as it was clear that the inner zone was going ahead. The Commission was asked to support the Recommendations within the report and if so to refer to OSM and subsequently to Full Council or to refer the report back to the Working Group.

The following comments arose:-

- Councillor Green felt they were good recommendations and that the Working Group had done a thorough job. She reported that it was felt that community engagement had not worked well as the public had not understood why the schemes were needed. She believed there was an opportunity to re-examine the prices of permits which would assist in making the scheme more acceptable to neighbourhoods rather than a scheme being imposed upon them. Each community was different and it was therefore important that schemes were flexible. There had not been enough flexibility in the Southville scheme ???as it should have extended permit times to Saturdays and on evenings when matches were held. The Chair referred to Recommendation 6 where it was

acknowledged that viable alternatives had been dismissed without evidence base;

- Councillor Martin did not feel the report fully reflected how critical some of the comments were in the working group and he would take his opportunity to convey this when the report was considered at Full Council. He asked whether Recommendation 6 could be tweaked to add at the end '(such as Clifton and Ashley schemes)' as he understood that wording had been agreed;
- Councillor Negus commented that it was not possible to expect a flexible system when there was an inflexible control imposed on residents by the Mayor. He asked where were the benefits to local communities in the context of officers wanting a unitary scheme across the City. He understood there was difficulties in operating 15 different schemes but residents would be supportive if they believed they were listened to;
- Councillor Martin recommended that the report be forwarded to OSM for consideration as the Working Group had worked hard to achieve the timetable for the report to be considered at Full Council in March. He reported that there had been confrontation and conflict in the Working Group with differing opinions and the report was strong for that. He believed that the Mayor did not know the City as well as he thinks he does as he would not have imposed a one size fits all scheme. He was dismayed to see the recent press release that Clifton Wood and Cotham would go ahead when the Working Group had worked so hard on this report. He believed this made a mockery of all the residents' efforts in attending this Commission and flaunted the hard work of residents and members. He emphasised that he was very annoyed, disappointed and contemptuous of the action. He felt there was still massive holes in the financing data and was convinced that that the exercise was purely a revenue raising exercise. He was pleased that this view was now on record and promised to be more expressive at Full Council. Finally, he acknowledged the hard work of the Chair of the Working and of officers in Peter Mann's team;

- Councillor Lucas supported the report's referral to OSM. He noted that his constituents supported the scheme and believed there were positives. He agreed that consultation had not gone well and encouraged officers to listen to bigger points ie. The use of pay by phone where he had been disappointed with officer feedback. He understood that this was the long term goal so wished to save the cost of the machines. However, he did believe that officers had listened and urged members to work with officers as the scheme had been imposed on them too;
- Councillor Pearce noted that this Council had won awards for community involvement and would therefore raise the uneven consultation in these schemes at OSM;
- The Chair reported that this scheme demonstrated the limited time the public were given in formulating questions arising from reports on publication of papers. He would raise at OSM the need to review either the date of publication or the deadline for which questions were required. He moved that the report be considered by OSM and on to Full Council in March and this was agreed.

RESOLVED -

That the report, subject to the small amendment to Recommendation 6, be forwarded to OSM for consideration and then on to Full Council's March meeting.

OSMB DRAFT MINUTE 20/2/14

92.02/14 RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES - CROSS PARTY WORKING GROUP REPORT

The Board considered a report from the Chair of the Working Group (agenda item no. 9) detailing the recommendations of the Working Group.

With particular reference to recommendation 3 it was noted that a park and ride route to Clifton had now been established to commence in April 2014.

With reference to recommendation 5 it was highlighted that initial projections of cost had been based on the commencement of the outer ring which had now been put on hold. It was proposed that the capital repayment scheme should remain at 10 years in order to reduce the cost to residents.

With reference to recommendation 6 it was noted that it had been altered following the consideration of the Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commission to: 'That where possible alternative schemes should be considered and incorporated by the officers into the final model (i.e. such as Clifton BID and Ashley proposals). Where a proposal is not feasible then a clear explanation as to why should be made available to the public.'

It was confirmed that there would be review stages for each RPS at the relevant time in conjunction with implementation dates of surrounding areas.

During discussion, reference was made to the following matters;

- It was important that developments in public transport took place in line with the process from the start in order to make it work. It was a concern if the bus reactivity was suggested as 3-6 months residents would not benefit from alternative options.

- It was suggested that reference to the statement of community involvement could have featured within the recommendations.
- Communication within areas proposed for RPS and those undergoing consultation was very important as some mixed messages had already been reported. Members reiterated the importance of involving residents in shaping individual schemes at the earliest possible opportunity.
- The installation of disabled parking bays was highlighted as it had been reported that the process had been delayed in some areas by plans for RPS. Officers were asked to confirm if this was the case.
- Members highlighted the possibility of the schemes becoming income driven once repayments of the capital had been completed and suggested safeguards would be advised to stop that happening in future. It was suggested that the Mayor be asked to consider using excess fines to pay off the capital cost quicker and as soon as possible.
- Members highlighted the practices in some other authorities to provide permits to medical practitioners to aid them in their duties. Members asked that something similar be added to the scheme for BCC.

After further discussion, it was:

RESOLVED -

- (1) That the report be noted and recommended to Full Council for discussion.**
- (2) That the working group be approached about adding the following recommendations to the report;**

5.1: That any enforcement charges gathered throughout the inner zone should be used to repay the capital costs as early as possible, and that

once the capital costs are paid off a review of permit prices take place with the goal of reducing permit pricing to the lowest possible level.

5.2: That medical professionals needing to carry out their duties within the city be issued with permits free of charge to allow them to carry out their duties in protecting public health.